DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 797 48 FL 002 878

AUTHOR	Moser, Charles A.
TITLE	Conference on Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Institute of International Studies (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	14 Jan 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-2728(823)
NOTE	118p.; Conference held October 28-30, 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Area Studies; *Bulgarian; *Conference Reports; Literary History; Literature; *Resource Materials; *Slavic Languages; Speeches; *Twentieth Century Literature

ABSTRACT

This volume contains the materials of the Conference on Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature including the texts of five papers prepared for the conference as well as a summary of the discussion which followed delivery of the papers. The works presented in this volume are: (1) Vivian Pinto's, "tThe History of Bulgarian Literature from 1900 to 1917;" (2) Edward Mozejko's, "The History of Bulgarian Literature from 1917 to 1944;" (3) Charles Moser's, "The History of Bulgarian Literature from 1944 to 1970;" (4) Howard Aronson's, "The Study of Bulgarian Language and Literature in the Context of Slavic and Balkan Area Studies;" and (5) Marin Pundeff's, "Scholarly and Library Resources for the Study of Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature." (RL)

ED 058797

FINAL REPORT
Contract No. OEC-0-71-2728(823)
Charles A. Moser
Department of Slavic Languages
The George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20006

CONFERENCE ON TWENTIETH CENTURY BULGARIAN LITERATURE

October 28-30, 1971

Report submitted January 14, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Institute of International Education

FL 002 878

Conference on Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature
Materials

This volume contains the materials of the Conference on Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature held at the George Washington University on October 28-30, 1971, and funded by a grant from the Institute of International Studies of the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Altogether, five papers were presented at the conference: Professor Vivian Pinto on the history of Bulgarian literature from 1900 to 1917; Professor Edward Mozejko on the history of Bulgarian literature from 1917 to 1944; Professor Charles Moser on the history of Bulgarian literature from 1944 to 1970; Professor Howard Aronson on the study of Bulgarian language and literature in the context of Slavic and Balkan area studies; and Professor Marin Pundeff on scholarly and library resources for the study of twentieth century Bulgarian literature. The authors of the first three papers, on segments of the history of twentieth century Bulgarian literature, were asked to consider three questions: a) an overview of the literary history of that period; b) a survey of work already done on the period by Bulgarian and other scholars; c) recommendations as to the most fruitful areas in which western, and especially American, specialists in Bulgarian literature might work. The first four papers (those by Pinto, Mozejko, Moser and Aronson) were delivered orally, each at a session of 2½ hours, and were followed by a general discussion among all the participants. The fifth paper, that by Pundeff, was delivered orally but not discussed.

This volume contains, then, the texts of the five papers prepared for the Conference on Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature as well as a summary of the discussion following each paper which was discussed.

The Participants:
Organizer: Charles A. Moser, The George Washington University
Howard Aronson, University of Chicago
Vladimir Butkoff, St. Louis University
David Bynum, Harvard University
Albert B. Lord, Harvard University
Edward Mozejko, University of Alberta
Vivian Pinto, University of London
Marin Pundeff, San Fernando Valley State College
Francis Salter, Fanshawe College
Ernest Scatton, Indiana University
Rapporteur: Eva Tchoukourlieva Salmoiraghi, Bethesda, Maryland

Also in attendance:
Philip V. R. Tilney
C.D. Dimov-Bogoev

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vivian Pinto, The History of Bulgarian Literature From 1900 to 1917 3

Edward Mozejko, The History of Bulgarian Literature From 1917 to 1944 37

Charles Moser, The History of Bulgarian Literature From 1944 to 1970 65

Howard Aronson, The Study of Bulgarian Language and Literature in the Context of Slavic and Balkan Area Studies 85

Marin Pundeff, Scholarly and Library Resources for the Study of Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature 97

BULGARIAN LITERATURE 1900-1917

by

Vivian Pinto
School of Slavonic Studies
London University

A. Historical Survey

Ladies and Gentlemen, it being my privilege to give the first paper at this Conference, allow me please as your guest here from the United Kingdom to begin by recording my thanks to the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare and to our host-university the George Washington, and also most particularly to thank and pay tribute to our host-professor Charles Moser - to him on two counts: first for his initiative and tenacity in organising this Conference, and, secondly, for his large advance contribution to it (if I may thus refer to his fine, forthcoming History of Bulgarian Literature (865-1944) to be published soon (may we all hope before this year is out) by Mouton of The Hague, Holland). When Professor Moser sent me the proofs of his book to read this summer, ~~my~~ reaction was a two-fold one: delight at such a service to Slavic studies (especially to this field of scholarship in the English-speaking world) mixed with -- I have to admit it -- consternation (on my own and Professor Możejko's accounts) -- that he had preempted us in our roles at this conference. For I can vouch that his fourth and fifth chapters of this book constitute expertly informative surveys of Bulgarian literary history of the pre- and post- WWI periods which, in my judgement within the scope and size of his work are unmatched by Bulgaria's own scholars as balanced, critical summaries of these literary periods -- obviously one cannot fairly include in this comparison the various relevant Bulgarian monographs of larger or more detailed range (which I will review briefly later in this paper).

Happily, by having thus advance notice of Charles Moser's work, I have been enabled, instead of going in any similar manner over the same ground, to endeavour now instead to supplement it. So first, to indicate what I am supplementing, I shall begin by giving, with your permission, Professor Moser, a very brief summary of your book's fourth chapter which forms your 60-page survey of this period of Bulgarian literature, which you have entitled "The Age of Modernism and Individualism (1896-1917)":

First, this Bulgarian literary period is characterised as being dominated by Dr. Krustev's and Pencho Slaveykov's 'Misul-circle' and by such aspects of their new literary "individualism" as Mikhaylovski's and Yavorov's pessimism and the effects in Bulgarian literature of German and French (now, as well as Russian) influences which, with the growth of Bulgarian literary symbolism, firmly upheld the new anti-collectivist, even 'ivory-tower' rejection

rejection of social function for literature. There follows the political and social background to this period: the course of Ferdinand's 'personal regime', the work of Professor Shishmanov's cultural consolidation of State Library, University and Theatre, and also Bulgaria's involvement in what was felt to be a compatriot Macedonian unrest, culminating in the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 with, ultimately, national prostration at the close of World War I. Thus primed, we proceed to the substance of Charles Moser's study of this period, his literary portrait gallery of the dozen or so outstanding individuals of this essentially individualist time in Bulgarian literature, each of them in succession carefully and critically assessed in his literary career and major works and each, too, appropriately epitomised in aptly chosen quotations from his works. Thus, first appears (as a link with the foregoing generation) the paradoxically Christian conservative nihilist, Stoyan Mikhaylovski; next, Pencho Slaveykov (with his companion, the poetess, Mara Belcheva), together with Dr. Krustev, Peyo Yavorov and Petko Todorov being each portrayed and compared to display the particular individualist achievements of the 'Misul-circle'; next, the rise of Bulgarian symbolism is traced, first in the apologias of Dimo Kyorchev, Lyudmil Stoyanov and Ivan Radoslavov and then in the poetic practice of Teodor Trayanov, Khristo Yasenov and Dimcho Debelyanov. The survey concludes with further illuminating portraits of the gifted, petulant Kiril Khristov, of his patron Ivan Vazov (i.e. in his later work and in his protracted historic feud with Krustev), of the prose-writer Georgi Stamatov, and, finally, with an account of the early 20th century Bulgarian theatre in the drama works of Vazov, Todorov, Strashimirov and Yavorov. I should add that, in the plan of the book, the narodniks Todor Vlaykov, Mikhalaki Georgiev and Tsanko Tserkovski are treated earlier than this period of 1896-1917 and the symbolists Nikolay Liliev and Nikolay Raynov later -- Elin Pelin, too, appears outside it (in the post-World War I period), the thematic convenience of treating him alongside Yordan Yovkov in a complete account of the history of Bulgarian literature being obvious. This account of the pre-World War I period is also backed bibliographically in the appendix by some eighty choice entries indexed under each of these main authors. This, then, in briefest resume, is Charles Moser's very satisfying survey of this period which, happily, we may soon hope to have in print. Very rightly, Professor Moser has concentrated on spotlighting the dozen more eminent writers of this period (the purventsi or 'primaries', as Ivan Bogdanov has called them) -- this would have been my approach too here today -- and through them he has caught much of the flavour of the period. This Zeitgeist I hope now likewise to convey but from a different approach, desiring (as I have said) not to repeat but to supplement and complement Professor Moser's survey. Please bear this in mind.

I ask you now to allow me these abbreviations: I will generally omit personal names after a first mention, thus Pencho Slaveykov will be henceforward Slaveykov; please take Sofia always to be the place of a works publication when none is mentioned; I will usually refer throughout this paper to "the years 1900-17 in Bulgarian literature" simply by the words "our period".

****

I want to begin by asking the question: can "our period" properly be called a "literary era"? If so, can we define a beginning, an end, even perhaps a middle to it and at what points? I think we can. An ending of a kind with the traumatic events of World War I's conclusion in 1918, a middle turning-point about 1907/8 and also landmark years, if lesser ones, in 1912 just before the Balkan Wars and in 1914, that brief respite preceding World War I -- this is the periodisation I wish to analyse while at the same time characterising the course of Bulgarian literature during the first two decades of this century. The beginning seems less easy to define than the end; ostensibly less dramatic, it would seem to present perhaps one of those periodisation problems history often offers to try a historian's skill or temper! But whether we start in 1892 with *Misul* which was the first major modern Bulgarian specialised literary periodical (with all due respect to the Vazov-Velichkov journals *Nauka* (Plovdiv, 1881-4), *Zora* (1885) and *Dennitsa* (1890-1))- or whether we start with the collapse of Stefan Stambolov's diktatura in 1894, or perhaps two years later with Slaveykov's first volume of his *Epicheski pesni* and Khristov's first volume of verse *Pesni i vuzdishki* both published in 1896 (the date at which Charles Moser begins his fourth chapter), or whether we start -- as the terms of this Conference would suggest -- with literary events at the actual turn of the century we can, I believe, discern around this time (as the 19th century was drawing to a close) the process of one literary era being succeeded by another on this small awakening stage of Bulgarian literature, still a European backwater but one of quickening interest at this time. On the one hand, we see then the sunset of national romanticism and of the Bulgarian *vuzrazhdane* (cultural revival) as the literary inspiration which had simultaneously both generated and dominated this national renascence throughout the 19th century (a process prolonged, notably by Vazov and Zakhary Stoyanov, till well after 1878 and even after the Bulgarian-Rumelian Union of 1885; it was strengthened, if anything, by those disillusioning realities of Independence which so specially occupied Mikhaylovski's attentions). On the other hand, (concurrent with a new attempt, this time, at an agrarian-social *vuzrazhdane* (reflected in an interesting, distinctively Bulgarian (if Russian-inspired) literary narodnik movement)), we have, in the 1890's, the tuning-up and overture to something quite new and previously unthinkable in Bulgarian literature, something moreover inspired from a new source of foreign influence, (the German one experienced by Krustev and then Slaveykov at Leipzig University) - I refer of course to the '*Misul* circle's' rejection of literary functionalism in favour of the primacy of aesthetic standards. They were to deny by this what till then for Bulgarian writers had always been virtually a sacrosanct tradition requiring literature to serve (and moreover be seen to serve) well-defined and currently appropriate religious, national, moral or social causes. These '*individualisti*' never claimed (as the symbolists by and large did) to banish these causes (or the areas of life they involved) entirely from literature - far from it, as the themes of their works very often show. But they did resolutely and unequivocably reserve their right, an artist's sovereign right, to serve such causes as and when their inspiration or inclination so moved them, when they chose or not at all. Freeing the writer thus (for the first time in the context of Bulgarian literary history) to search and use the whole range of his personal experience and feelings as a critical creative individual (a *kriticheski misleshta lichnost*, as they termed it) was a very great step and one which I consider both essential to their successful challenging of the Vazovian literary school and also an absolute pre-requisite to the possibility of this particular, belatedly renascent literature's participation in any contemporary European literary movement. (As I have tried to show in my study of the "Civic & Aesthetic Ideals of Bulgarian Narodnik Writers", even such socially motivated men as Vlaykov and Tserkovski had also then been groping towards some kind of ultimately aesthetic justification of literature). I would mark the real moment of a literary revolution here, however, with Slaveykov's return from Leipzig in 1898 and the establishment of him, Petko Todorov and Peyo Yavorov as accredited *postoyanni sutrudnitsi* on the editorial board of Krustev's *Misul*, forming thus the new Bulgarian literary 'young' school, as Krustev was to characterize it later. So I come back again to the importance of *Misul* attracting these two brightest young Bulgarian talents of the time, Yavorov and Todorov, who (by joining *Misul*) were declaring their transference of allegiance from their civic narodnik Muse to this new 'individualist' creative endeavour in Bulgarian literature. Bozhan Angelov significantly entitles his chapter on this period "The resurgence of Bulgarian literature and life to a new cultural ideal: the era of Pencho Slaveykov from the appearance of his "*Blyanove*"(*Epicheski pesni*, Vol II (1898)) to the death of P. Todorov in 1916. Finally here, lest you feel we have overstressed the "individualisti" (Angelov was himself closely associated with *Misul*), I quote this brief recent Bulgarian view:

> The years 1901-10 were a time of particular intensity in Bulgarian intellectual life when our literature was experiencing one of the most decisive moments of its development, including on one hand polemics on socialism fought out in *Novo vreme*, *Obshto delo*, *Demokraticheski pregled* and *Misul*, on the other hand the definition of the literary individualist aims in Slaveykov's preface to Yavorov's *Stikhotvoreniya* (1904) retaliatory to Vazov's attack prefacing Khristov's *Izbrani stikhotvoreniya* there was also the aesthetic movement's effort to establish its positions in Krustev's "Za tendentsiyata i tendentsioznata literatura" (1903) and his "Edin pogled vurxu nashata literatura" (in *Misul*, XVI, 1906), and finally there was the emergence of the first adherents of 'modernism' in Ivan Andreychin, Trayanov and Dimo Kyorchev.

I make no apology for having analysed at some length the beginning of this period, since it is, after all, the Bulgarian literary curtain's rising on the *entire* period being considered by us at this Conference. Also, it is, in my view, a major, if not THE major turning-point in the whole of modern Bulgarian literature; it forms (as I shall try to show in my conclusion) a much more significant literary break than was to take place at the end of WWI. I go on now to characterise the first part of this literary period up to the beginning of the three Wars in 1912, defining also the significance of 1907/8 as a middle or turning-point in our literary periodisation of this time.

****

Whether it is the dialectic of literary progress or simply nature's law of tribe and herd, the establishment of a new literary era is usually marked by the "toppling" of older writers from their position of literary prestige and the aiming of apposite criticism at their ideas and styles by younger men confidently offering their literary alternative. Who were these *stari*, the literary 'old brigade', whose dominance over this little livening Bulgarian literary scene was now to be challenged in the first decade of the 20th century? The narodniks of the 1890's, like Vlaykov, Georgiev and Tserkovski were now turning from the literary to the political pursuit of their ideals, while Mikhaylovski, now nearly 50, continued to combine both these things in his satirical verse writings. Of him B. Angelov wrote (topically, in 1905, in his "Literaturen portret" of *Misul* (XV, 1905)) that he, Mikhylovski, was "now reaching wider sections of our reading public, bidding fair to fill the place Vazov looks unable to retain and will have to yield to another", and indeed, at the beginning of 1905, Mikhaylovski does seem to have risen to become (in Krustev's words written a couple of years later in his *Stari i mladi*) a *naroden tribun* "the central figure of socio-political interest to the Bulgarian public", but this tribuneship ended there-and-then with his requesting and accepting in 1906 a literary pension (the second one, if one counts Vazov's) from the regime he had been so virulently satirising. In any case, he was (again in Krustev's words) "a literary and social phenomenon, defying classification into any category", qualifying thus the more as a literary research theme (Charles Moser's portrait of him shows that too) but the less as a reliable literary rallying-point for the Bulgarian intelligentsia of that time. Outliving all the '*Misul*-circle' and even Vazov, he remained active enough but on the literary sidelines throughout our period including the Wars (his pithy verse comment on them I will include in the concluding postscript to this paper).

Quite different was Vazov's calibre on the Bulgarian literary scene. His literary career bridged from the *vuzrazhdane* to national Independence -- his first poem *Borut* (The Pine Tree) had been printed right back in 1870 in the veteran *Periodichesko Spisanie* (Braila) days of Bulgarian emigration in Rumania (before that early learned monthly's transference to Sofia and to ultimate Academy status). And now, so far from vacating his literary 'throne', he looked like settling down in it, to become a 20th century author as well! Pensioned and recognised (especially for his *Epopeya na zabravenite* and *Pod igoto*) as the national writer and laureate of the new Bulgarian literature, he retired in 1900 not from literature but from politics (he had just been Minister of Education) into literature, bent now on the fulltime cultivation of his Bulgarian Muse. He continued to write throughout our period till after World War I (he died in Sept. 1921), adding volume after volume to his varied corpus of Works in almost all genres of literature, to fill thereby ten pages of bibliography for his publications 1900-17 alone in Prof. Petr Christophorov's fine dissertation-monograph on *Ivan Vazov: la formation d'un cerevain bulgare*. Vazov, moreover, was read - and read not just by intellectuals: his novel *Kazalarska tsaritsa* sold a then for Bulgaria unheard-of printing of nearly *6,000 copies*, in months; he was a favourite, too, in the Bulgarian repertoire at the newly founded National Theatre where, records Christophorov, "ses pieces se jouaient constamment." This then was the formidably prestigious Bulgarian one-man literary institution with which, at the beginning of this century, any new literary movement had to reckon. Backed by Shishmanov and his friends on Prof. Bobchev's *Bulgarska sbirka* (1894-1915) and cherished by a wide reading-public, he had founded and himself virtually was one (the then single one) of what Stefan Karakostov was later to call "the two main lines of our modern literary history," and we can now see how his tradition has persisted, remaining renewable in Bulgarian literature even now in our time, as witness the work of the late Dimitur Talev. Yet, his literary position was"assailed" during the first decade of this century, and successfully too, by his adversaries on the Bulgarian literary scene. His 19th century services to Bulgarian literature remained of course beyond reproach as part of the heritage on which new Bulgarian generations were already being brought up, but, *vis-a-vis* the new 20th century Bulgarian realities, he was being found *demode* and inadequate, not (I repeat) by the wider reading-public but in almost all the new Bulgarian literary circles, whether of *Misul* or anti-*Misul*. In fact, outside *Bulgarska sbirka* and perhaps Vlaykov's *Demokraticheski pregled*, few critics did not indulge in the sport of toppling Vazov from his long-held literary throne. It was the'realist' critics, too, who now faulted this founder of modern Bulgarian literary realism. Stefan Minchev criticised his prose, Strashimir Krinchev his plays, and the left-wing critics too quite reasonably found him barren of the new ideas this small growing intelligentsia was so avidly thirsting for. The literary case of these critics against Vazov is summed up for us to read in Albert Gechev's "Ivan Vazov pred suda na literaturnata ni kritika" in one of the earliest Bulgarian Festschrifts: *Sbornik v chest na Prof. L. Miletich* (1912). But the initial and main challenge came of course from the *individualisti* of *Misul*, from its editor Dr. Krustev and, most of all, from Slaveykov, the real contender for Vazov's seat of literary authority. To dislodge an incumbent so well established and blithely long-living as Vazov demanded tenacity and entailed perhaps inevitably all the bitterness too. But it was achieved and surprisingly quickly, principally by *Misul's* influence; in fact, the negative achievement of this changed-attitude-to-Vazov, K. Konstantinov records as having been *Misul*'s one single and only effective general influence on young writers of that time. For this became generally confirmed throughout the other literary coteries (though they had also their own antipathies to Misul). To Vazov remained loyal only his own 'entourage' comprising Bulgarska sbirka, Velichkov's Letopisi (till its end in 1905) and the governmental establishment as represented for a few years in the person of his great friend Prof. Dimitur Shishmanov (who was responsible for the enlightened official approach to the arts during his term of office at the Education Ministry (1903-7), a brief and brilliant patronage, quite exceptional in Ferdinand's reign!).

After preliminary skirmishes, which Charles Moser has described in his study of Dr. Krustev, the battle of the prefaces was joined in 1903 and 1904, Vazov prefacing Khristov's poems and Slaveykov counter-attacking in his preface to Yavorov's second edition of his first poems, each side at the same time proclaiming its prodigy poet-rightly too, for (pace Vazov) Khristov and Yavorov were easily the brightest beacons in Bulgarian poetry since Botev.

Let us pause here to consider the nature of the Slaveykov-Vazov rivalry and how far it was founded on antithesis of literary character. The curious feature here, as considered now in the perspective of three-quarters of a century later, is the amount of common ground occupied by these two almost archetypal figures of Bulgarian literature. They shared a common distaste for, even disgust with symbolism, naturalism and modern French literature. Slaveykov is on record as having told Simeon Radev he could see nothing in French poetry after Victor Hugo, which was precisely where Vazov's interest in the Gallic muse concentrated, and ended. They also shared a common devotion to 19th Century Russian literature as a humanist-realist tradition from Pushkin to Tolstoy, and also a common rapturous predilection for Italy, its art and tradition of Renaissance culture. If Vazov spelt out his patriotic sentiments more directly, even at times naively, Slaveykov yielded him nothing in the fervour of his heroic national ideal. If Slaveykov could only match his childhood reminiscence of the Stara Zagora fire against Vazov's adult memory of the 1870's and the 1876 April Rising, he nevertheless cherished the link with those times of his beloved father Petko, that prodigious teacher-journalist-poet of the vuzrazhdane. He drew heavily for literary themes on the same sources of national history as Vazov, choosing to create the same "epic" of the April Rising as Vazov had offered as a novel in his Pod igoto, only Slaveykov presented it rather differently, using the ancient and venerable (if now, as Radev thought, demode) genre of epic verse for his Kurvava pesen, which, though never completed, was his lifetime's work and includes that fine evocation of a national mystique embodied in his image of the Balkan mountains. Of course there were major differences in their characters abundantly obvious in an even cursory comparison, witness for instance the attitudes and interests displayed in Vazov's Epopeya na zabravenite and Slaveykov's Epicheski pesni. Their very places on the Bulgarian literary scene contrast dramatically; whereas Vazov had the gift of poetry (in fact it came too easily for him to take pains to sustain its quality), Slaveykov had usually to wrest it from his Muse by feats of determination which ensured his critical care but incurred that cerebral character rightly recorded by Charles Moser. Quite beyond Vazov's ken, on the other hand, was Slaveykov's heritage of philosophy and aesthetics acquired from his German teachers, and his wide appreciation of European literature, ranging from his favourites,"the Greek, the Jew and the German Schwab" (Goethe, Heine and Nietzsche) to the Scandinavian authors and to our Shakespeare, Shelley and Tennyson. Suffice it to say here that Slaveykov, partly by his domination of *Misul* and patronage of Yavorov and Todorov, partly by the poetry of his *Epicheski pesni*, *Sun za shtastie*, *Na ostrova na blazhenite* and also *Kurvava pesen* and his fine forthright mordant critical prose and, most of all, by the sheer aristocratic moral integrity of his character, by all this he was able in the event to present the then much wished-for and swiftly welcomed alternative to Vazov. He soon acquired for the *Misul* circle and himself Vazov's former literary authority to an extent that his death in 1912 left the younger generation of Bulgarian writers and intellectuals (even in the presence of that ever-active literary father-figure Vazov) feeling orphaned -- Konstantinov clearly remembers that -- orphaned by the loss of Slaveykov, of someone they had of course often seen around, never known personally, yet always sensed and respected as the presiding literary personality of their time. The literary hegemony which *Misul* wrested from Vazov and maintained, was, however, being challenged itself even from the turn of the century, always from the "left" by the moderates of *Obshto delo* as well as from *Novo vreme*, and always too by the 'old' school (who never accepted the 'dethronement' of Vazov) - because *Bulgarska sbirka* remained a literary force (using younger talents like Nikola Atanasov and Spas Ganev, as well as its editor Prof. Bobchev and figurehead Vazov). There was, too , a varied enough field of new *mladi*, of young 'independents' seeking to present in their turn, an alternative to *Misul* and of course itching to appropriate for themselves its place of literary prestige. There emerged at least three such groupings: no real threat to *Misul*, somewhat erratic and in due course 'modernist' was Strashimirov's *Nash zhivot* (1901-2 & 1905-7) supported also by Khristov and Mikhaylovski; then also like them, originally a defector from *Misul*, Ivan Andreychin acquired his own motley following which, despite even stronger 'modernist' pretensions, backed by his own interesting work and periodical *Iz nov put* (1907-10), rated rather for showmanship than strength of literary talent. Thirdly, and this time originating quite separately from *Misul*, was the grouping of gifted young literary wits and critics linked usually with the persons of Balabanov, Elin Pelin, Loyadzhiev, Podvurzachov and Dimo Kyorchev and with such literary humorist periodicals as *Bulgaran* (1905-9), *Osa* (1909-10) and *Slunchogled* (1909). Important too was the one more serious contender of the time for *Misul*'s place, the Radev-Balabanov-Genadiev *Khudozhnik* which immediately set a standard in both content and technical quality, when it appeared in 1905; it was good, certainly, but eclectic-to-the-point of lacking the kind of purposive literary impact then wanted. It was here in 1907 that Krustev's literary prestige took a trouncing from Radev's article "Dr. K. Krustev kato literaturen kritik", this attack being redoubled and trained on the whole *Misul* circle in 1910 when Y. Marinopolski printed his newspaper-volleys as the book *Krititsi: otzivi na edin chitatel* (Turnovo, 1910) -- Marinopolski was a defector from *Misul* but not, it seems, with any ill will: it is said that on days when he passed by a shade too quickly, that same Slaveykov we have been considering called out: "Nedey byaga, Yordane, be — nyama da te biya Yordan — I shan't beat you! No need to run!" But that's another story. My point here is that none of these groupings, interesting though each is, was quite able to acquire the literary stature and solidity needed to replace *Misul*. As Strashimirov (himself one of the contenders) regretfully and laconically put it in his *Nash zhivot*: "Starite sa otrecheni — mladi nyama" "The old are discredited, yet there are no young to replace them", implying (you will note) that the "*Misul* circle" have now been demoted (or perhaps just elevated, as we do in Britain with our House of Lords) to take their place among the *stari*, the literary "old brigade".

This is where it becomes important to define 1907-8 as a middle or turning-point, even (one might say) a zenith in our period. It was the time when, with the Turks' final recognition of Bulgarian sovereignty, Ferdinand translated himself from Prince to Tsar while domestically getting into considerable government trouble (with the fall and assassination of D. Petkov coming on top of the railwaymen's strike, the anti-monarchist whistling demonstrations and the University crisis which ended in the collapse of Minister Apostolov's blackleg university and the triumphal total reinstatement of academic staff and students). Even greater national excitement was generated by the Turkish *Khuriet*, that is Sultan Abdulhammid's apparent capitulation in July 1908 to demands for the constitutional government of his Rumelian province of S. Thrace and Macedonia; in Stamboul (Prof. Geoffrey Lewis tells us in his recent *History of Modern Turkey*, 1955), "Bulgarian priests publicly shook hands with Turkish officers, and Macedonian bands of revolutionaries (who for years had been waging war against the Government), now came down into the towns and announced the end of hostilities." Slaveykov celebrated his Directorship of the new National Theatre by taking his company on a universally acclaimed tour of Macedonia. It was a moment of exhilaration and hope, the first such real Bulgarian one in this century, the zenith (at least in this respect) of our period.

In literature it was a time of promise, if not excitement. There was indeed the setback of Prof. Shishmanov's resignation from the Ministership of Education (he had refused to countenance his government's University policy); this terminated those stimulating *komandirovki* abroad for promising writers and scholars and ended that brief and, for Ferdinand's reign, exceptional interlude of official encouragement of the arts, initiated by this patron of letters, himself a fine scholar and critic (educated, like Krustev and Slaveykov, at Leipzig). *Misul* closed down and in the endeavour to fill its place there was a marked gathering of momentum among the various literary groupings (and their 'movements', insofar as one is able to define them as such). But, most important of all, this was the moment when Bulgarian symbolism or 'modernist' *novi veyaniya* (new trends as they were then called) may be said to have "arrived" (and moreover arrived to stay) on the Bulgarian literary scene (to stay till the end of our period and beyond the Wars, till the end of the 1920's). But to say that Bulgarian literary'individualism' ended in 1907/8 and was promptly succeeded by a Bulgarian symbolist movement which began then, would be a misleading simplification. Literary movements do not suddenly materialize with the mature splendour of an Aphrodite stepping from her shell, nor normally do they, even in their good time, just vanish into thin air. Much more typically they overlap, and generously, too (by years rather than months), two or more main rivals occupying the literary scene contemporaneously, those in or near the wings ready (in their time) to move in and play centre stage. So, to say as some critics do, that, by this point of 1907/8 in our period, the *Misul* 'individualist' movement was bankrupt, refuted or defeated is palpably incorrect; the literary prestige and productiveness of Slaveykov, Yavorov and Todorov was never higher than in the years 1907-11 --- they may have been then taking their place as Strashimirov implied among the *stari* (at least in younger writers' eyes), but they were still unquestionably *purventsi* in Bulgarian literature then too. Again, it has been said that Bulgarian symbolism dates (fully-fledged and unharbingered) from this time and of course, Yavorov's poetic metamorphosis just at this date can conveniently be put forward to support this. But the origins of Bulgarian symbolism go back to some years earlier, almost (one might say) to the start of the century, with Ivan Grozev's poem "Az esum" (logged by Bogdanov as the very first manifestation of Bulgarian symbolism) and certainly to Andreychin's poems of 1902 *Pesni-novi stikhove* (Varna, 1902) which, however much he tried to defend them against the furious pack of critics as a take-off of Khristov's 'wine, women and song' verse, were in truth his one-man introduction into Bulgarian poetry of both the French *decadence* and naturalism. Teodor Trayanov, too, studying at the Vienna Technische Hochschule from 1900, was starting to write symbolist verse under the influence of Richard Dehmel, Stefan George and other German symbolists; by some critics his poem 'Noviy den', which Genadiev printed in *Khudozhnik's* first year (1905), is considered to be the first Bulgarian symbolist poem.

Such were the preliminary, harbingering tremors of Bulgarian symbolism. The definition of 1907/8, however, as the turning-point fully confirming symbolism as the new Bulgarian literary movement is well based on Andreychin's new periodical *Iz nov put* (1907-10) and on Strashimirov's *Nash zhivot* with their outright symbolist programs and manifestoes and also particularly by the publication in 1908 of Trayanov's first volume of poems, the *Regina Mortua*, which Bogdanov has called "the first forthright manifestation of the Bulgarian symbolist poet Trayanov and at the same time the most direct expression of the Bulgarian symbolist movement." Should one go further and couple with this yet a third event, namely, the poems *Bezsunitsi*, published by Yavorov on his return from his *komandirovka* in France (1906-7)?

The poetic and psychological crisis whereby Yavorov at this date entered his last period of poetry he has himself quite specifically recorded in his "Pesen na pesenta mi" and Arnaudov pursued it further with him personally in a *literaturna anketa* of the time. "I sheered back (*oguvax se*) like a donkey at a bridge. I just couldn't bring myself to cross that bridge into 'decadence'," Yavorov himself graphically admitted. Whether crossing a bridge or entering a new period, such a poetic metamorphosis of Yavorov would of course fit neatly the idea of Bulgarian literary 'individualism' being transformed into or replaced by symbolism as a precisely pinpointed succession of literary periods in 1907. But, for attesting the entry of symbolism into Bulgarian literature I myself (despite Georgi Tsanev's cogent defence of Yavorov as Bulgaria's first symbolist poet) regard this as an interesting but *lesser* event, one by no means irrelevant to French 'modernist' influence on Bulgarian poetry but certainly secondary in this particular respect to the work of Andreychin, Grozev and especially to that of Trayanov. Simeon Radev, a good scholar of 19th century French poetry and painting, flatly rejects the notion of Yavorov being a symbolist at all, at least not in any French literary sense; a warm admirer of Yavorov in his first period of poetry (i.e. the one preceding his visit to France), Radev also interestingly diagnoses as the two great misfortunes of Yavorov's career (inhibiting even prohibiting a much greater fulfilment of his brilliant promise) as having been first Yavorov's strong involvement in the "*Misul*-circle", and secondly Shishmanov's sending him to France. And yet one has to say that in Yavorov's later verse of *Bezsunitsi* where he explored to the bitter depths, the more morbid and even demoniac range of symbolist moods, he continued here also to render rich service to the development of Bulgarian poetry; even if Boyadzhiev remonstrated at his "algebraically" arbitrary and variable use of love as a symbol in this poetry, yet Debelyanov, Liliev and Dora Gabe and others each found in him something of a poetic mentor.

There still remains no adequate study of the Bulgarian debt to French symbolism or to its further German or Russian forms, but this much one should stress concerning its pre-1918 period: despite the manifest symbolist credos of Andreychin (in *Iz nov put*), of Strashimirov (in *Nash zhivot*) and of others in 1907 and successive years, the fact remains there was at this time no recognised unswervingly symbolist literary periodical compared with Milev's *Vezni* or Radoslavov's and Trayanov's *Khiperion* after World War I. Thus *Zveno* (which in its brief 1914 appearance was run largely by Podvurzachov, Debelyanov, Liliev and K. Konstantinov) printed (inadvertently it seems), one of Radoslavov's more extreme symbolist advocations but, having done so, promptly and firmly closed its pages to him, anxious not to acquire any type-cast symbolist image for their periodical or indeed for themselves. These young writers were far from seeing themselves then in the role of any exclusive symbolist clique, being in fact a rather miscellaneous company (a bohema, they called themselves) of literary friends, several of whom (Liliev, Popdimitrov, Trayanov and Milev) were abroad in France or Germany for most of these pre-World War I years (so this might more appropriately be termed the pre-War period of Bulgarian 'proto-symbolism', though it certainly envisaged and prepared the later main post-War Bulgarian symbolist movement). This explains too the sometimes unsymbolist mixture of literary motifs in their poetry, reflecting on the one hand the appropriateness of many of Verlaine's, Samain's, Moreas' and Jamme's symbolist moods to the quite literally and patently miserable melancholy Sofian lives in fact led by these young Bulgarian admirers of French literature, yet also directly and tragically reflecting that reality and, in the cases of Boyadzhiev and Debelyanov, for instance, even including strains of humour and satire quite untypical of symbolism (foreign or Bulgarian). Podvurzachov, the "father" (*bashtata*) of this group (as they called him), personified (in his own eclecticism and variety of literary skills and moods) the elusive character of this interesting literary *confrerie* where the label of symbolism seems more safely attestable in each writer, or even each poem, rather than applied to the group as a whole. But one can say that, nevertheless, in the main, these writers showed themselves dedicated to re-expressing their favorite aspects of French, German or Russian symbolism in terms of their own contemporary experience, and moreover that because this style expressed so poignantly their mood of this time, theirs proved to be the literature which (though they were publicly and socially less dominantly assertive than the *individualisti* — not one of them for instance could match Slaveykov in this respect -- theirs was the literature which nevertheless marked them as successors and also in some respects as heirs to the "*Misul*-circle's" heritage, and so, in their introvert, self-mourning and tragic way they held the literary stage (even though hardly caring to claim it !) for the rest of our period. The measure of this is, that hardly any Bulgarian writers of the time (whether one thinks of Yavorov, of Todorov, of Khristov's Intermezzo poems or Strashimirov's plays) remained outside it, no one of note I think except Stamatov, Elin Pelin and of course, the by now two literary'old brigades' -- I refer to Vazov, Mikhaylovski and Vlaykov on the one hand and to Bozhan Angelov and Slaveykov on the other. Not that it was roses all the way: like Vazov and then the *individualisti* in their day, this literary modernist new trend aroused its own opposition and incurred critical attacks from various quarters: "left" and "right" happily joined forces for this in *Suvremennik* whose editor Georgi Bakalov wrote alongside Mikhaylovski's anti-modernist philippics; Minchev took a similar view in the broader *Obshto delo*, in Vlaykov's *Demokraticheski pregled* the same angry reaction came from Albert Gechev (who contributed also, we have seen, to Vazov's 'dethronement') and also from Str. Krinchev and from Vl. Vasilev -- the very title of his article "Panteisti i maniasi" squarely expressed his feelings on this subject; from *Bulgarska sbirka* N. Antanasov, Spas Ganev — now too one "Dr. Kotlarevski" (who was none other than the future philologist Stefan Mladenov) turned their guns now on what they saw as an even worse form of literary 'individualism'; and finally Angelov issued his warnings in the concluding years of *Misul* and Slaveykov too, in his review of Bulgarian poetry "Bulgarska poeziya predi i sega, II:sega" in *Misul* (XVI, 6-7, 1906), turning on the full heat of the Slaveykovian 'holy anger' in his famous footnote thirteen which I now give you in translation.

> I refer (writes Slaveykov) to that new trend down the path of that mentally blacked-out 'symbolism' involving

> a whole ballyhoo of street-urchins who, it seems, have somehow gotten the impression that any old rubbish written in verse becomes poetry, that any bedraggled old head-mop becomes a hair-style. This urchin-gang has now tempted into its trash dump even grown-up poets like Yavorov and Khristov. Not all that's born is fit for life but what's already long dead and buried in Europe now seems to be just coming into fashion here with us!

Let us now consider in conclusion the final part of our period (1912-18), which has been called by Georgi Bakalov, writing in his Borba (a periodical itself suspended from 1914 to 1918 by the Wars), a murtva ivitsa, a no-man's land in Bulgarian literature. I find this an over-simplification, as one could well expect from an immediately retrospective comment made in 1919. It was certainly, in the life of this small emergent southeast European nation, a time of elemental upheaval and catastrophe. But one must not forget (Bulgarians themselves sometimes do) that there continued to exist, through this difficult and threatening time, a whole literary investment which had been quite securely, if quickly, built up (over the previous admittedly all too few decades) into a by then quite strong and well-distributed portfolio, broadly definable (we have seen) as the individualisti, the neo-romantic modernist-symbolists, the satiric and realist 'independent' (among whom by now we can include the old literary doyen himself, Vazov) and also the then relatively dormant and still not too exclusive leftwing literary movement. Nor were these accumulated literary assets, any of them, exhausted; rather they formed together a newly-acquired literary tradition solid enough to survive and remain (even through years of worst wartime abeyance) still available as a resource for future development either along their separate literary paths or more probably, revivable in some form of synthesis appropriate to new times.

Though this time saw physically the end of the three outstanding individualisti who all died, creatively speaking, tragically before their time (Slaveykov in 1912, Yavorov in 1914, Todorov in 1916), one cannot (I have said) talk of the decline and bankruptcy of their literary movement; after their deaths, their work still remained an enlivening part of this freshly created Bulgarian literary heritage -- it remained (again in Karakostov's words) "one of the two main lines of our modern Bulgarian literary development". The issue was even reopened and debated in a lively polemic conducted in 1918 at the close of our period by those two University professor-litterateurs, Penev and Arnaudov. And, despite Slaveykov's and Angelov's declared antagonism to Bulgarian literary symbolism, I reiterate my view that the achievement of the Bulgarian symbolist movement would have been hardly possible without the Misul heritage -- Debelyanov's moving verse-testament to Slaveykov is eloquent testimony to that. I maintain too that the "Misul-circle", reluctant though it was to recognise such an offspring, made possible not only this new receptivity to contemporary French, German and Russian 'modernist' influences but, even more important, it made possible the capacity to assimilate them in some Bulgarian form which could integrate with this young, rapidly developing modern Bulgarian literary tradition. This process from its beginnings earlier in our period (during *Misul*'s final years), now blossomed into the remarkable first pre-war full flowering of Bulgarian symbolism in 1912 with Trayanov's second volume *Khimni i baladi* and Raynov's new legend-style symbolist prose *Bogomilski legendi*, in 1914 with Popdimitrov's *Placheshti vurbi* and L. Stoyanov's *Videniya na krustoput*, and also with Debelyanov's finest and final poems written successively right up to his death on the Salonica front (Oct. 2, 1916). Present also during this closing war-time part of our period were of course the Bulgarian realist writers (though they were not yet inheriting the whole literary kingdom, as Bogdanov and other critics seem sometimes to imply). I refer to that essentially ungroupable body of realist "independents" (including the satirists), all by definition individualists (if assertedly not *individualisti* in the '*Misul*-circle's sense). Thus Balabanov, with Podvurzachov and others, re-started '*Bulgaran*' in 1916, though both it and its colleague-satiricals *Baraban*, *Lyudokos* and *Smyakh* were inevitably to carry a heavy war-time imprint. Elin Pelin, while having been writing throughout our period, finally "arrived", winning general recognition in 1911 with his second volume of stories *Razkazi* Vol. II, including his first longer work, *Geratsite*; he published his main version of *Nechista sila* in 1914 and, serving as a war correspondent, still managed to complete and publish by the end of 1917 the *shopsko* dialect humoresques *Pizho i Pendo*. Vazov turned out wartime poems, Khristov too, his ringing with jingoist *patriotarstvo* -- *Boyan Magesnikut*, his verse tragedy (so controversial in the 1908 drama competition) was published in 1914. Stamatov published his second volume of 'naturalist' stories of Sofia urban life, his *Skitsi* in 1917. Strashimirov was too taken up with publicist work to publish more than a play in 1917 and his novella *Gabrovka* in 1918.

So Bulgarian literary activity went on and, even if, during the World War, it seemed somewhat like a clock running down, the landscape is not quite so bleak as Bakalov's *murtva ivitsa* might suggest. It is true that the wars took their toll of literary life; the roll of honour includes among its victims not only Debelyanov, Cheren and Popanastasov, but several others, less known but of good literary promise, like Vl. Musakov, Str. Krinchev and Kiril Gyulemetov. It took its toll too of Bulgarian literary periodicals, killing Bobchev's *Bulgarska sbirka*, Andreychin's *Biseri* and Podvurzachov's *Zveno* and also after nearly twelve years of very intermittent appearance, Strashimirov's *Nash zhivot-Nablyudatel*, while suspended for the duration were *Demokraticheski pregled*, *Listopad*, *Suvremenna misul* and *Novo vreme*. Viewing this final 3-War part of our period in perspective, I do nevertheless detect clear indications (two in particular) suggesting the considerable potential and promise which Bulgarian literature then held and which almost certainly in less adverse national circumstances would have been well on the way to fulfilment by the 1920's; that it was not fulfilled during the wars, we must agree with Bakalov; whether it was quite recognisably the same promise merely postponed by a decade of war that was fulfilled later in the 'twenties, I must leave to Edward Możejko's judgement. The two manifest signs of this potential for literary achievement, postponed perhaps fatally by the wars, are I would suggest to you first - the number of highly promising young writers either making their debuts or firmly establishing their literary reputations then particularly in these early War years (even if we exclude the War victims, it still leaves a remarkable number of such, not only the symbolists Popdimitrov and Liliev (both back from France), Trayanov and Geo Milev from Germany, Lyudmil Stoyanov, Kunev, Raynov, Yasenov, Podvurzachov and the dramatist Konst. Mutafov, but still others such as Raychev, Yovkov and also Mikhail Kremen., Dobri Nemirov, Damyan Kalfov, Dimo Syarov, all these last four publishing their first important works, novels in each case, in 1914). The other symptom on which I assess the strength of this Bulgarian literary promise latent in the wartime period is the buoyant, even exhilarated literary mood in that short war-free moment of respite in 1914 and also in the time just before the Balkan Wars of 1911-12. It is true that in 1911 the usually perspicacious Sirak Skitnik wrote this very unexhilarating diagnosis of this Bulgarian literary moment, asking: "Who can say -- are we artists or clowning talentless fools, teasing the crowd with our foreign, borrowed gags?" Moreover, Boyadzhiev's suicide in 1911 and Slaveykov's death in 1912 were dark enough storm clouds of literary tragedy: and yet this prelude to the Balkan Wars saw not only Elin Pelin establish his literary reputation with his Razkazi Vol. II, but the publication of some of Khristov's best poetry Khimni na zorata and Slunchogledi including that very fine poem "Purva lyubov" and of Yavorov's two drami (V polite na Vitosha, and Kogato grum udari, 1912) and also the remarkable new symbolist writing of Trayanov, Popdimitrov and Raynov. But the Balkan Wars over, 1914 seems to have been an even more promising year for Bulgarian literature; brief interval though it appears in retrospect, it seemed at the time, of course, a rescue from, not a relapse into further war and national doom. That year of respite 1914 held hope for Bulgarian literature, not only in its books (in that variety of verse and prose we have noticed published by a whole wave of talented new younger writers) but also in the promise, however shortlived, of its literary periodicals. I refer especially to the all too brief Zveno the significance of which K. Konstantinov recalls in these words:

> After those stormy tragic moments of the (Balkan Wars) (which fell like a curtain across our nation's first decade of comparatively idyllic peace starting the 20th century), after the Misul generation had passed away, the year of Zveno's appearance, in fact Zveno itself stands unquestionably as the link between two epochs perfectly symbolising this in the very meaning of its name. The group which combined to create this periodical were to give us not a few of the great names who have become the pride of modern Bulgarian literature..whether

one recalls it as a survivor from that time or whether one is a literary scholar thumbing over its five numbers in a library, the artistic and historical worth of this periodical stands out only too clearly.

Zveno was conceived and edited by a group of some of the best young writers of the time, Debelyanov, Raychev, K. Konstantinov, Nikola Yanev, Geo Milev, Liliev and also the young Yovkov, all under the brilliant "fathership" of Dimitur Podvurzachev,"bashtata" was (we have seen), his nickname in his group. This Zveno had, in Konstantinov's words, "all the prospects and potentiality of a long and interesting life." It seems not too much to suppose that, in more peaceful times, it would soon have become established as the periodical of the range, standard and standing for which Bulgarian literature was to have to wait until Zlatorog in 1920. It epitomises the latent Bulgarian literary promise of this time and proved perhaps the saddest war-victim of them all by the unexpected briefness of its appearance (5 numbers only - Feb.-July 1914) -- it and other Bulgarian literary periodicals of the time were then superseded by the wartime official literary organ Otechestvo (1914-8) (which can claim the merit of carrying Bulgarian literature through the first World War but little more). Zveno and its demise as war-victim suggest most strongly of all that, but for the interference of war, there could and would have been a continuing ripening growth and development of Bulgarian literature from the 20th century's first decade right through, unbroken and unscarred, into the twenties and thirties. In my view, therefore, this does not mark a succession of literary eras at all in the way that had done the turn of the century and the whole Slaveykov-Vazov Misul-Bulgarska sbirka antithesis. The 3-War period, traumatic national experience though it clearly was, looks much more like a time of 'suspended-animation' than any significant literary break with the past or drastic new turn into the future. The wars had their direct repercussions on Bulgarian literature, of course, and these were not negligible, whether one considers the victim-writers and victim-periodicals or the use of war-themes in the prose notably of Yovkov, Kalfov, Kremen and the verse of Vazov, Khristov, Borina, Stamen Panchev, and Ivan Yonchev. But, despite all this, much the same literary tradition, resources and range of potentialities remained to be revived and continued in the 'twenties by men who, older, wiser and somewhat scarred by the wars, were in the main still much the same body of writers as in the war decade; even the considerable wave of younger writers had almost all made their debut at the start of or before the end of the war period and were continuing their work from then rather than starting off on new literary careers. To the extent that the wars caused interruption in Bulgarian literature, this seems to have been a fundamentally extraneous imposition of circumstances rather than any kind of deepseated change, crisis or revolution inherent in the course and development of Bulgarian literature itself, as was the case, I maintain, at the start of the 20th century. Accordingly, I see a strong case for regarding the end of the second decade of this century not as a break or turning-point in 20th century Bulgarian literature but as a slowing down, a pause, at most a War-induced hiatus in its general 20th century development. In this sense, but only in this sense, it seems to me, it affords a convenient point of periodisation at which to end the first literary historical survey paper of this Conference. To conclude, I now offer you, before going on to my other two rubrics of "Bibliography" and "Recommendations" for research, these two short postscripts, each illustrating the mood and condition of Bulgarian literature in these War years. First (as I promised) from the work of that other Bulgarian literary 'ancient' (who, like Vazov, survived the War period intact), Stoyan Mikhaylovski - here is his thumbnail verse-portrait of the Balkan Wars in 24 words (almost entirely nouns!):

Rebellion. Bombs. Blood.
Mass meetings. Words. Tears.
Alliance. War. Mud.
Pro-Slavism. Anti-Slavism. Cheers.
Savage Serb. Mad Vlach. Disgust.
Greek blindness. Treachery. Loot. And Dust.

I conclude this short moving epitome of this period from the memory and experience of an important participant in it, the late Konstantin Konstantinov:

> I remember in that year 1916 (like every year till the end of the War) we were not living so much as waiting, waiting endlessly for the end of that dark time in all its dreadful weight of death, suffering and uncertainty. In fact, the whole life of our generation seems in retrospect to have been one interminable waiting for that "tomorrow" when at last with a sigh of relief we might quietly sit down to do our favourite work. Only quite brief periods -- a few years up to the Balkan Wars and a few more between the World Wars -- stand clear like little islands of peace amid all those whirlwinds of terror, that holocaust which our century was. That is why, I suppose, we were simply swept along, always racked by this dilemma: the elemental events which kept devastating our world never appealed to our hearts and yet, even without our assent we had to participate in them, arrange and tune our whole existence to them. So we sleepwalked through this incongruous time, a time for which we just had not been made.

B. Survey of the Major Work on our Period

Bibliography is a subject of fundamental value to us all, but it is also notoriously better written-and-read than spoken-or-heard, so I will seek not to drown you in detail in offering you now some account of the major work done on the literature we have been considering. I shall try also not to tread on the ground of Professor Pundeff's address. I hope he will please forgive me where I do.

I know of no exhaustive bibliographical monograph devoted specifically to the Bulgarian literary period 1900-17. But there are useful data to be culled from B. Angelov's "Obshti pomagala i nasoki za izuchavaneto na bulgarskata literatura" (in *Chitalishte*,) V. 9-10, 1923) and his "Pomagala i izvori za istoriyata na bulgarskata literatura" (in *Rodna rech*, V, 1-2, 1931-2), both articles being reprinted in his *Literaturni statii* (1960). Relevant also here is the yearly and monthly literary chronicle for the years 1900-17 (including bibliographical data and commentary) on pp. 342-395 of *Bulgarskata literatura v dati i kharakteristiki, 817-1965* (1966) by Ivan Bogdanov whose *Kratka istoriya na Bulgarskata literatura*, Vol. 2 (1971) contains in its part 1, pp. 1-326 many well-documented footnotes and tailpieces of bibliography on this period. Another chronicle, an annual one, recording work done *inter alia* on our period is, of course, "the year's work in Bulgarian studies" regularly prepared(under the rubric Chroniques - bulgare in the *Revue des études slaves*)by my friend Professor Roger Bernard of the Ecole des langues orientales vivantes in Paris. A special new *Dictionary of Bulgarian Literature* , presumably including also studies in early 20th century Bulgarian literature, is in preparation (Professor Dimov told me recently) at the Bulgarian Academy's "Institute of Literature," in Sofia; till it appears, we must content ourselves with the bio-bibliographical data (indexed under authors and so easily selectable for our period) from the late G. Konstantinov's *Bulgarski pisateli* and his more up-to-date, larger reference book of the same title published in 1961 and compiled in collaboration this time with Tsvetan Minkov and Stoyan Velikov -- both works include some literary scholars as well as authors, the latter book being richer in article references but often weaker and briefer in its biographical data. The Kiril and Metodi State Library's "Bibliographical Institute" could well have accumulated selective bibliographies on this period unpublished, but, at last, as an introductory bibliographical aid for the American or English researcher on this period, I doubt they could better Charles Moser's "Selective Bibliography" I have already quoted as being the appendix pp. 259-262 to his new book's Chapter Four "The Age of Modernism and Individualism" (1896-1917), to which list (I remind you again) this present bibliographical survey is offered as supplementary. I must mention here also, both for selective bibliographies and for a wealth of factual and critical data, the six-volume *Biblioteka bulgarski pisateli* published by Fakel(and undated but in fact 1929-30), the famous collection of studies on leading Bulgarian literary men by divers hands under the editorship of Professor Arnaudov, our interest being here of course the final three volumes covering 16 authors of our period from Vazov to Elin Pelin (I exclude of course Zakhary Stoyanov and Aleko Konstantinov as not belonging to 20th century). Arnaudov (that fine nonagenerian as he now is, I understand, still hale, hearty, and busy at his beloved Bulgarian literary research in Sofia) himself did Shishmanov and Yavorov in this series which extends up to but little beyond World War I, including only Debelyanov from the Bulgarian symbolists. What a good enterprise it could be for Western scholars to pick this up where Arnaudov left it off 40 years ago and bring it up to date or at least up to World War II, selecting of course judiciously, as Arnaudov I think quite successfully did, who are the primary authors of each period. (But I am jumping ahead to the final "suggestions" rubric of this paper!).

Histories of Literature should properly be left to Professor Pundeff, but I hope he will not mind if I now touch very briefly on the validity of some of the main ones to our present period. On his recent visit to London, Professor Dimov (who has recently moved from rectorship of Turnovo to Directorship of the Institute of Literature) told me he sees the literary critic and historian as quite different animals, sometimes complementary to each other but usually representing an antithesis in their functions, and he cited Boyan Penev as having been too formidable a literary critic to be a satisfactory historian. Well, I for one regret profoundly that the admirable Bulgarian Literary History based on Penev's university lectures had to end so prematurely at its final Volume with Botev, because I consider that something of this stature for subsequent Bulgarian literature still remains to be written. Nearest to it comes, I suppose, the new Bulgarian Academy four-volume Istoriya na bulgarskata Literatura (volume 3 covering this period, I know to be in print but it has not reached me yet) and, secondly, Bogdanov's Vol. 2 of his Kratka istoriya na bulgarskata literatura already mentioned. Less comprehensive perhaps for this period but often more stimulating and original and certainly more broadminded are those two pre-Marxist textbooks, compiled just before World War II and both published in 1943, Malcho Nikolov's Istoriya na Bulgarskata literatura and G. Konstantinov's Novobulgarska literatura Vol 2: ot Paisi Khilendarski do nashi dni -- the latter's understanding of Bulgarian literary personalities I find particularly illuminating and warming, if lacking in the factual detail of the Academy's and Bogdanov's currently compiled histories. Tsvetan Minkov's handbook Ocherki po bulgarska literatura (1948) may be piecemeal and already firmly Marxist fare but it contains some tidbits of detail not easily found elsewhere.

I turn now to work done on this period by its actual participants either at the time or later in retrospect. Of first importance here as source work done on our period are Krustev's essays Mladi i stari (Tutrakan, 1907) and his last essays on Botev, Slaveykov, Todorov and Yavorov (published in 1917), Slaveykov's critical essays (especially his "Bulgarska poeziya predi i sega" and his "Blyanove na edin moderen poet" concerning Todorov) and the whole corpus of critical reviews and essays done by literary men at the time in the various periodicals of the time from Misul and Bulgarska sbirka, Letopisi and Demokraticheski pregled to Nash zhivot, Iz nov put, Khudozhnik, Slunchogled, Zveno and others I have alluded to in my paper. Some were printed in book form at the time like Andreychin's Kniga za teatura (1910) and his V mulchanieto na noshta (1905) and Y. Marinopolski's Krititsi (Turnovo, 1910) and some since like N. Atanasov's Silueti na bulgarski pisateli (1916), B. Angelov's Literaturni statii (1960) and S. Radev's Pogledi (to which I will return). Finally, here, one should not ignore the various Bulgarian Festschriften appearing ever since the Sbornik v chest na Prof. L. Miletich (1912), which contains some rare material on our period. Some Post-World War I periodicals also contain much material on our period, e.g. Zlatorog, especially its early numbers.

A verdict on Bulgarian literature of the early part of this century has been given in literary histories by three scholar-critics, who themselves each contributed to the literary life of the time. Thus B. Angelov, himself a close associate of the Misul circle (as we have seen) managed to include in the last three chapters of Vol. 2 of his Bulgarska literatura do dnes (1924) that very period up to the 1920's, the absence of which one regrets in Penev's Literary History. In this (one of the earliest attempts at a history of modern Bulgarian literature), he periodises a first Bulgarian literary age of the 20th century as "The era of Pencho Slaveykov from his Blyanove (1898) to P. Todorov's death in 1916", following it by his final chapter entitled "The contemporary literary movement" which ends at the 1920's. Secondly, again by a literary participant (Ivan Radoslavov) is the Bulgarska literatura 1880-1930 (published 1935), a history (in this case) rather of literary movements culminating in Radoslavov's own favorite symbolist movement in which he played such a prominent part both before and after World War I. Most curious among these literary historical testaments is the work of another leading symbolist of the time, N. Raynov, namely his nine-volume Vechnoto v nashata literatura (1941) - it includes in its portrait gallery the same leading writers of our period as does Charles Moser (except that Raynov not unexpectedly for a symbolist omits Stamatov): each of Raynov's portraits is built (with a critical commentary), round a copious succession of extracts from what Raynov considers the most significant works. It is thus a literary portrait gallery, anthology and history combined.

Memoirs and reminiscences must rate high among work done on this period as being of course primary sources for its study. There exist here some well-observed accounts of the material environment, life and interests of early 20th century Sofia society in, for instance, D. Kazasov's Ulitsi, khora, subitiya: Sofiya predi polovin vek (1959) and also the charming littel Sofia predi 50 godini (1947) illustrated by that great caricaturist of the time Alex. Bozhinov and written by Georgi Kanazirski-Verin, one of the original habitues (with Andreychin's literary coterie) of the Armensko Cafe. (Interesting for comparison here is Petur Mirchev's Sofia zavchera (1969) which does much the same thing for post-World War I Sofia). These settings enable us to join literary figures of that time now in their old age returning back through memory to the pre-World War I literary scene they themselves once helped to create and to which they have now been adding their final literary postscript. High among these must rank Konstantin Konstinov's admirably informative and evocative Put prez godinite (2 vols. 1961), the first volume being a chronological literary diary of our period and the second, essays on selected themes concerning this. Part autobiographical notes on this period and part literary essays is also Simeon Radev's

Pogledi vurkhu literaturata i izkustvoto-lichni spomeni (1965). Neither of these works has the index their meatiness merits — one finds oneself inevitably pencilling one in! Valuable too here, if one allows for the subjective bias, are the first five parts (up to p. 311, the year 1917) of Khristov's diary extracts *Vreme i suvremennitsi* (1921) in his *Works*, V, 1967 and also his memoirs *Zatrupana Sofiya*. A considerable variety of personal reminiscences of literary figures of this period are now also available in what constitutes a treasury of memoirs in several volumes, published by the State Publisher *Bulgarski pisatel* from 1963 onwards as a series under the rubric *V spomenite na suvremennitsite si*. It includes thus one volume devoted to Slaveykov, Yavorov and Todorov. another to Debelyanov, Liliev and Raychev, another to Strashimirov, in Pelin and Yovkov and so on. There is, too, a not inconsiderable literature of small volumes of casual literary reminiscences and notes each with their specific occasional value, e.g. Vicho Ivanov's *Dalechni i blizki* (1968), Khristo Mindov's *Tvortsi na slovoto* (1953), P. Neykov's *Tekhnite obrazi* (1955), D. Babev's *Nashite pisateli* (1916), Zhorzh Nurizhan's *Stozheri na bulgarskata literatura* (1941), S. Popvasilev's *Sreshti i razgovori* (1960) and P. Tikholov's interviews with Elin Pelin and Liliev.

Next, authors' texts in properly edited collected works are an essential primary contribution to the work done on any period and here there have been valuable recent additions such as the 3 vol. Todorov (1957-8), the 5-vol. Yavorov (1959-60), the 7-vol. Strashimirov (1961-63) and also the 10-vol. Elin Pelin and 8-vol. Slaveykov (both of 1958-9), the Slaveykov one owing much to Boyan Penev's original 7-vol. editions of 1925 and 1929, the latter including the letters to Mara Belcheva. The symbolist poets, being mostly less prolific, are more readily collected and have also been usefully served with a 3-vol. Liliev (1964), a 2-vol. Debelyanov (1968-9), also a 1-vol. edition of Yasenov and of Boyadzhiev (both 1957) and now at last, though only in a single volume of *Selected Poems* a Trayanov (1966), but still no Kunev (other than the *Antologiya* of 1938), no Ivan Grozev, no Ivanov-Cheren and no Andreychin; a recent 1-vol. Strashimir Krinchev (1968) may, one hopes, harbinger more texts of such less-known but interesting writers of this period. Happily, almost all this near-impeccable textual scholarship dates from the end of or after the Stalinist "cult" period of the 1950's, so the Marxist tone of introduction and commentary-notes is not so much the former totalitarian tone of strict party-line as the patronising "tempora mutantur" tone of "poor fellow, we scientific Marxists of nowadays of course know better then you ever could have done !" (see for example P.P. Slaveykov, Coll. Works, V, notes on p. 435, 422 3 et alia); this tone is happily less raucous but still dogmatic and capable of interfering with scholarship.

For the critical and biographical work done on this period, I will confine myself mainly to the major monographs, since the considerable body of articles and smaller pieces are rather fully listed (though not attested) under authors in G. Konstantinov's bio-bibliographical literary reference books, which I have already mentioned (both entitled Bulgarski pisateli, dated 1947 & 1961). This period marks the beginning of that branch of literary fieldwork and 'live' research, the literaturna anketa, the literary inquiry or cross-examination; Professor Ivan Shishmanov conceived this idea of a personal direct literary investigation of his great friend Vazov, the results being edited in Iv. Vazov: spomeni i dokumenti (1930) by Shishmanov's friend and distinguished literary monographer, the now nonagenarian Prof. Mikhail Arnaudov. To Arnaudov, a specialist in the Vuzrazhdane, we owe also two particularly outstanding monographs on this period: his anketa (conducted "live") on Yavorov i.e. Kum psikhografiyata na P.K. Yavorov - suobshteniya na poeta i nablyudeniya in the Sofia Univ. Yearbook enlarged as his monograph P.K. Yavorov, lichnost, tvorchestvo, sudba and reprinted in 1961, and , secondly, his recent fine K. Khristov Zhivot i tvorchestvo (1967), which well evokes round its central figure a sense of the whole contemporary Bulgarian literary scene. This effect is also sometimes achieved in the other major monographs relevant to this period, notably Mrs. Ganka Naydenova - Stoilova's 2-vol. study of Yavorov (1957-8), V. Vulchev's Iv. Vazov:Zhiznen i tvorcheski put (1968), R. Rusev's Tvorchestvo na Elin Pelin do Balkanskata voyna (1954) and M. Genov's Elin Pelin: zhivot i tvorchestvo (1956). One might add the smaller but still fairly comprehensive M. Nikolov's P.P Slaveykov: zhivot, lichnost, deynost (1939), L. Georgiev's Petko Y. Todorov (1963) and G. Konstantinov's Nikolay Liliev (1963). Besides these, we have the smaller, usually pocketsize monographical ocherk or study-sketch of individual writers, far too many of them of course to list here, not that one should despise or ignore them — they are often well enough written and, in some cases, constitute the only study to date of certain writers, e.g. Minko Nikolov's one on Strashimirov (1965) and L. Georgiev's small study of D. Boyadzhiev (1963) in the "Bulgarski pisatel" series (sub-titled "literaturno-kriticheski ocherk"). Nor should one overlook here such small specialist studies as the Narodna prosveta series of stylistic analyses "Biblioteka literaturni razbori", e.g. Svetozar Tsonev's Poeziyata na D. Debelyanov (1965). Here I must mention, too, Stefan Popvasilev's studies of styles and linguistic characteristics of Bulgarian writers (including several of this period) in his Stroiteli na rodna rech, Vols. 1-2 (1954 & 1959), based on his earlier Bulgarskiyat pisatel i rodna rech (I, 1933 & II, 1937). Among these ochertsi, I must draw attention to a little known work of particular value to my present paper, Ivan Bogdanov's study of 7 minor literary figures all of our period, from which he has created his "sketches from Bulgarian life during the first years of this century till the Wars", i.e. precisely the period of cur present survey; this book is entitled Sputnitsi na purventsite (1960) and comprises a series of illuminating little studies of these seven less known figures of this literary period (complete with introduction and index).

Work done on this period beyond the Bulgarian borders is scanty, one has to admit, by comparison with the corpus of native scholarship here, nor (with or without freedom from Marxist bias), is it necessarily reliable. Thus, in his Ocherki istorii bolgarskoy literatury XIX-XX vekov (Moscow, 1959), the Russian scholar D.F. Markov, with a cool Marxian sweep, blankets Slaveykov and his literary associates under the "decadents", using also in the same context that tricky term 'modernism'. The Bulgarian 'individualist' movement does not fall into this category: Slaveykov, its unquestioned eminence, stated his antagonism to it scathingly in his Note 13 to his essay on Bulgarian poetry "Bulgarska poeziya predi i sega". I have already mentioned the Revue des Etudes Slaves annual bibliographical commentary and chronicle of Bulgarian literature and I mention again here Petr Christophorov's elegant monograph on Vazov: la formation d'un ecrivain bulgare (Paris, 1938). I add Georges Hateau's pleasant little apercu, Panorama de la litterature bulgare contemporaine (Paris, 1937), which quite properly emphasises various French influences on Bulgarian literature and concerns our period in its last chapters.

In English we have the pages relevant to this period of two small anthologies: my London University one of 1957 and Professor Bynum and Lord's Bulgarian Literary Reader (1960). Until Charles Moser's book presently supersedes it, we have had up to now only one attempt at an English coverage of Bulgarian literature in Profs. Manning and Smal-Stocki's History of Modern Bulgarian Literature (1960), the reliability of which (concerning this period) is marked by such statements as that (on p. 101) "Vlaykov's penname (was) Venelin, borrowed from the distinguished early friend of Bulgaria", that (on p. 126) Elin Pelin, after his rejection from the Art Academy "remained a teacher (and writer)" and that (on p. 108) Slaveykov remained studying in Leipzig from 1892 "until 1908" -- this would have been an ewige Studentenschaft! He would have had but four short years to establish his literary eminence in Sofia before dying: 1898 was of course the year he completed his Leipzig studies and returned home to Bulgaria. But to disparagers of this History, I would point out it has nevertheless its useful moments like its details of Bulgaro-Ukrainian literary relations and Professor Shishmanov's friendship with Mihail Dragomaniv.

For smaller studies in English, my articles in the London Slavonic Review on "Aesthetic and Civic Ideals of Bulgarian Narodnik Writers", on T.G. Vlaykov and on Elin Pelin have some bearing on this period, but not, of course, the direct relevance to it of Charles Moser's 1964 Study of "Dr. K. Krustev: A Bulgarian Mentor": in characterising Krustev here, he has given a most pleasantly informative introduction also to this period.

Clearly wide vistas lie open when we come, as we must now, to the last rubric of this paper: Suggestions as to the most appropriate areas in which Western and especially American scholars may work.

C. Recommendations for Further Work

I did originally assume (I hope rightly) that this part of the Papers given at this conference would probably be regarded as the most important part of it by its organisers. (Whether it or the problems of periodisation (with which I started and concluded it), or the emergence of and reactions to literary trends of the period) I chose these approaches first (as I have said) to try to complement Charles Moser's survey of this period but also all of them as likely to lead to further subjects worth investigating by Western, including (naturally) American scholars. But I have some more suggestions to add now under this concluding rubric, not all necessarily arising out of the aforesaid; these I would like to give you now finally, if you feel able to bear with me a little longer.

I will consider first the monographic study of individual men of letters, and then other areas which suggest themselves as providing worthwhile themes for research. Taking the literary men first then, one cannot help being struck by the comparative lack of investigation at two quite different levels of this literary landscape, namely some of the peaks, like Slaveykov (perhaps the crowning peak of this period) and secondly, several of the not so barren foothills, namely those less eminent, less-known, yet significant literary figures I have already hinted at. Of the 'Misul-circle' Yavorov has, of course, attracted the lion's share of literary investigation(not to mention of biographical speculation!) and Petko Todorov has now at last one tolerably thorough monograph (Lyuben Georgiev's of 1963), but Slaveykov, Krustev, and , among the symbolists, Trayanov still await thorough monographs appropriate to their particular degrees of distinction and (one could hope) on the scale of the work already done so well on Yavorov, Khristov, Vazov and Elin Pelin. What Arnaudov has done for his friend Khristov, Boyan Penev, the meticulous editor of Slaveykov's works, would (had he lived) doubtless have done for his friend Slaveykov too. As it is, the appropriate monument to Slaveykov (which K. Konstantinov recalls to have been planned yet somehow never even started) has not yet even been built in words either, despite some articles and M. Nikolov's useful work of 1940. I would suggest, here too, three more appropriate studies, also monographs on authors, if of a more multiple nature: first a monograph on the Musul circle, involving a quadruple biography of Krustev, Slaveykov, Yavorov and Todorov and an analysis of the sources and evolution of their Misul relationship; secondly, a study of the "alumni of Leipzig" in early 20th century Bulgarian literature, sometning likely to prove an interesting exercise in foreign influences and contrasting developments, when one considers the range of these alumni from Shishmanov, Krustev and Slaveykov to Marinopolski, Khristov and Geo Milev: thirdly, a study of the pre-World War I Bulgarian proto-symbolists as a group, including the genesis of symbolism in Bulgaria, its French, Russian and German sources and the Bulgarian forms it took, prior to the post-World War I period.

Let us turn now to those foothills we talked of. I repeat here again that, already in this literary period of the early 20th century, there is considerable scope for discovering less-known literary figures and revealing both their significance within this literary period and also their artistic merit, however 'miniature' such figures may prove to be --- Elin Pelin was, after all, essentially a prose-miniaturist and one of no large output either. My view of this area of research is underwritten by these words of Iv. Bogdanov in his Sputnitsi na purventsite (p. 384):

> There has been hitherto a quite wrong attitude to research in the field of Bulgarian literary history, whereby literary development has been represented by most of our literary historians as the work of a few established writers, reducing thus our entire literary history to some 20 or so post-Liberation writers and quite casually entirely eliminating everything else. Our scholars have surveyed individual peaks but generally failed to peer into their foundations or follow the paths to these peaks ... Literature is a complex living organism, a process of continuous flow and national movement evolving from many persons small as well as great, unknown as well as known ...

Among the more notable of these less-known writers I have already mentioned, are Andreychin, Boyadzhiev, Cheren, Pepo Vl. Popanastasov, Ven. Tin. (Stefan Tinterov), Yordan Leonardich, Ana Karima and Vl. Musakov. Beyond this, I would recommend would-be investigators who are in search of a worthwhile subject to take a look among those habitues of Andreychin's group at the Armensko Cafe including Stoyan Shakle and Nikolay Nikolaev (Bezdomnik) or the several members of the Bulgaran circle -- its founders, Khristo Silyanov and Alex. Kiprov, or Dimo Kyorchev, Dim. Podvurzachov, Andrey Protich, Yosif Herbst and Alex. Bozhinov as well as Alex. Balabanov himself. Another not so lesser figure yet hardly studied at all is Ivan Grozev, dramatist and symbolist poet. It is in the careers of such men, writers and litterateurs-journalists with varied artistic and other interests, that one may often best re-assess the Bulgarian intelligentsia of this time, now no longer in its clearcut 19th century national and social role, but developing towards the moral and aesthetic individualist ideals of a new kind of cultural intellectual community.

What other areas, apart from these and apart from the themes of my paper, invite investigation into the Bulgarian literature and literary life of our period? I would suggest these as a list and then consider each briefly: The uses of the Bulgarian folk tradition by writers of this period; the extent and effect of foreign literary influences of the time; the debut of women writers in Bulgarian literature; Bulgarian prosewriting during these two decades; next, Macedonia, war, grief and love each as particular inspirations and themes in the literature of this period; and finally the founding and development of the socialist literary movement up to World War I. Obviously, some work has been done in these fields, but none of them (in my view) has been adequately covered and some hardly at all. They each seem to me to represent rather promising and challenging subjects for Western scholars' investigation, as I shall now try to show.

The first of these themes (writers' uses of the Bulgarian folktradition) is strongly relevant to our period — neither before or after, was such an amount of literary interest shown in this. After the Liberation of 1878, the few Bulgarian authors of standing had been too busy celebrating the past or satirising the present to continue the experiments of Slaveykov's father Petko into the literary uses of that remarkably rich and well preserved Bulgarian oral folk tradition (especially the folksong). But Slaveykov inherited this interest from his father. Incidentally, the literary use of folk motifs in this period supplied me with the example of such which I required, to open my study of Bulgarian and Macedonian Dawn-songs (published in Professor A. Hatto's worldwide analysis and anthology of these entitled EOS (Mouton, 1965), namely these lines, used to tease the schoolteacher and so end his class in Strashimirov's *Krustoput* (1904):

> "The cocks are crowing for dawn now, Let us be gone, dear love, now let us be gone!"

There is an occasional folklore motif of this sort in Elin Pelin — one cites especially, from the end of our period, *Pizho i Pendo* (1917), a remarkable example of 'improvised' literary folklore, the representation by a literary writer of a rural milieu in its own authentic voice and style (without his educational or other sophisticated influences in any way intervening). Three other writers of this period achieved this folk identification to a remarkable degree. I refer to the verse or rather songs of Kiril Khristov in his *Samodivska kitka*, of Tsanko Tserkovski, and also of Trifon Kunev in his earliest period of writing, Kunev's being particularly authentic and free from the sentimental narodnik vein in Tserkovski. Ana Karima's work in this field should also be noted, e.g. her *Razkazi po narodni motivi* (1912). The *Misul* writers Slaveykov, Yavorov and Todorov, though accused of "Europeanisation", showed here a professional native interest unknown to the patriot Vazov, each exploiting this folk heritage in his individual way. I mention only Slaveykov's *Koledari* song-cycle, Yavorov's *Khaydushki kopneniya* and Todorov's *Idilii* or prose-poems. For the translation and investigation of these last, I would enter here a special plea; while agreeing with Charles Moser that their merit varies, I consider that merit at times very high indeed and of course most relevant to the investigation of how folk motifs and language have been exploited in Bulgarian literature.

Foreign literary influences on Bulgarian writers of this period present a particularly extensive and diverse subject for investigation. These influences were beginning to arrive then by a variety of channels (which in themselves could form an interesting subject of study) such as foreign schools or universities, diplomatic service in foreign countries, sending of literary men abroad (notably on Professor Shishmanov's initiative 1903-7), the staging of foreign plays at the new National Theatre and of course the availability of foreign periodicals and books, which were being increasingly translated (when not available through the Bulgarian's ever-accessible medium of Russian - of all the subscribers to the leading Russian symbolist periodical *Vesy*, Bulgarians comprised one whole quarter!). Ivan Bogdanov surveys the main foreign influences on our period (pp. 320-7, Vol. 2 in his *Kratka istoriya na bulgarskata literatura*), while M. Nikolov summarises more briefly (in his *Istoriya na bulgarskata literatura* (1947) p. 288) that mounting Bulgarian obsession with foreign literature at this time, quoting *inter alia* the interest in Przybyszewski and Artsybashev (especially the latter's novel *Sanin*) as reaching quite 'epidemic proportions'. The particular interest of this investigation would lie in assessing how far in each case these foreign influences remained recognisably foreign in the Bulgarian literature of this time and at what point each such influence was rejected or assimilated. In the view of Slaveykov and Todorov, for instance, great literature of the past and present should supply models but could also act as a catalyst on the Bulgarian writer to release in him the expression of his own cultural heritage. The distinctive later influence in this Bulgarian literary period is of course the 'second wave' of French influence on such 'symbolists' as Yavorov, Boyadzhiev, Popdimitrov and Liliev (as opposed to the earlier wave of French romantic influence on Vazov, Velichkov and Mikhaylovski. Hardly less influential at this time (particularly - but not only - on Bulgarian dramaturgy) were the Scandinavian writers, especially Henrik Ibsen. It still remains for a Western Scandinavo-Slavist scholar to reassess fully this influence, first considered by the Bulgarian symbolist poet and comparative literature scholar Popdimitrov in his *Ibsen i Ibsenizmut v literaturata*(in Sofia University yearbook XX, 4, 1924) and also in Professor Shishmanov's address given at the Sofia National Theatre, "Henrik Ibsen" (printed in *Uchilishten pregled*, 1928, pp. 369-76), in which he observed that "there was a period in our literary history, about the end of the last century and the beginning of this, when almost the entire Bulgarian younger generation (young writers, students and school-pupils) became *ibsenised (tsyalata bulgarska mladezh beshe ibsenizirana)* and for years Ibsen was never off our stage".

Comparable in strength to the more intellectual excitement of such ibsenisation was the emotional focus of this time on Macedonia, regarded obsessively as being linguistically, culturally and historically a compatriot area doomed to go on suffering the Turkish yoke (which Bulgaria itself had shaken off) and only severed from the rest of Bulgarian dialectal territory by the chicanery and double-dealing of the Great European powers --- and (if we are to believe Radev, Gotse Delchev and other Macedonians) there was mutual basis for such feeling. Kazasov records how at this time Sofia restaurants fairly hummed with *makedonstvuvane* (which I think one should render as 'macedonating'); most vociferous, of course, was the "Macedonia" itself, its restaurant usually full of Macedonians and Bulgarians forming a third bread of "Macedonating Bulgarians"('makedonstvuvashti bulgari'). It is of course the tracing of this as a literary inspiration which I am recommending as a subject here for research in the works of Vazov, Khristov, Anton and Dimitur Strashimirov, Arseni Yovkov and of course Yavorov. If one excludes here Krustev, Radev and the alleged Macedonian ancestry of Vazov and the Slaveykovs, we have here primarily the literary work of "macedonating Bulgarians" rather than of Macedonians themselves as were those mid 19th century writers Dim. and Konst. Miladinov, Purlichev and Zhinzifov who pioneered what they claimed to be a West-Bulgarian school of Bulgarian literature (in the St Kliment of Ochrid tradition!). Despite his verse representation of such West-Bulgarian or Macedonian themes, Vazov never attempted any kind of *Pod igoto* in Macedonian terms, having intended in that novel to evoke the national life and experience of the whole of Bulgaria, Macedonia or Western Bulgaria being therein included; in due course D. Talev has indeed fulfilled this role with the distinctive local colours of Macedonian life but within the tradition(a Vazovian tradition) of Bulgarian language and literature. Coupled with Macedonia, one could also consider war-and-rebellion as literary themes of this period from the peasant unrest in 1900 at Shabla and Durankulak as well as the 1903 Macedonian Ilinden and Thracian Preobrazhenski Slav risings of Turkish Romelia to finally the 3-War part of our period (1912-18), the latter being reflected partly at the time in the verse of Vazov, Debelyanov and Khristov and in the stories of Yovkov and Kalfov, and partly in retrospect, as was done by M. Kremen in his novel *Bregalnitsa* (1920) and by Trayanov in his *Bulgarski baladi* (1921).

Even more pervasive a theme here than Macedonia or war, is the literary expression of grief, that great crushing burden of grief and frustration of that doomed generation which K. Konstantinov has so surely conjured up and pictured for us in his autobiography. Indeed the word *skrub* (and also perhaps *blyan* - the dream yearning of this frustrated generation) combine with *ibsenizirane* and *makedonstvuvane* to form the key epitomatory words of this pre-World War I Bulgarian literature. The nature and different sources of this grief and its various forms of literary expression would be found to concern most Bulgarian writing of this period and so a study of this would contribute a basic psycho-literary analysis of its literature under the epigraph, perhaps, of Andreychin's significant lines: "Kogato sum shtastliv, as burzam da zhiveya / Zlochest li sum -- togava samo peya!" "Happy, -- I myself in life immerse / when I'm miserable, I turn to verse!"

The last but certainly not least of these specific literary themes I would like to recommend as having particular relevance to our period is *love*. Now, 19th century Bulgarian literature recognised and generally promoted such loves as love of one's country (the subjugated *rodina*), love of the "little-brother" - peasantry (narodnik-style) and also love of education (prosveshtenie), but love of the other sex, no; while remaining (one supposes) a normal enough part of life, this was hardly sung in Bulgarian literature, until the individualisti at the beginning of the 20th century emancipated the individual Bulgarian writer from exclusive dedication to all those other till-then de rigueur national-and-social loves. It was thus almost solely from Slaveykov's "Anastas Khristopoulou-influenced" father Petko that the new Bulgarian epicurean Khristov could claim even the vestige of any Bulgarian 19th century tradition, but he (Khristov) took it in fact (some state) "direct from life". There had always of course been the folk model which reflects rural life and (as Pencho Slaveykov affirmed) reflects it whole - (to its own kind of human delicacy, any puritan squeamishness is quite alien!) Petko Slaveykov's and Gerov's use of this folk source was revived by Khristov, Tserkovski, Kunev and notably the individualisti - witness Slaveykov's 'Nerazdelni", Todorov's 'Nad cherkvata' and also Yavorov's 'Kaliopa', each in its own way a splendid Bulgarian Romeo and-Juliet display. Bulgarian symbolist poetry has too its own range of erotic approaches from Boyadzhiev's vivid, bright "Murgashka" to Popdimitrov's cycle of female portraits, from Debelyanov's sapphic evocation of his known and unknown mistresses to Liliev's virginal moods of ethereal love. But the central figure in this throughout this period is Ivan Andreychin, who devoted special attention to the whole erotic aspect of literature from the naturalist decadent verse of his 1902 Novi stikhove (which included his'Khram na razvrata' and the prostitute's portrait "Pesen na Katerina" that so incensed the young Vladimir Vasilev) to his analysis of this subject in his essays Kniga za lyubovta i zhenata (1910) and his anthology of erotic literature Kniga za lyubimata (1914), including his own charming poem "Pesen na zhenata" and his prose-poems on this theme.

There is work to be done, too, on the literary genres of this period. An investigation of the development of its poetry would, I think, be almost tantamount to a full survey of its literary history, so great and continuing was the interest of Bulgarian writers in verse then: a main object here could be to compare the aims and achievements of the individualisti and their poet-successors, the Bulgarian symbolists. A study of early 20th century Bulgarian drama could also prove fruitful (as Charles Moser has well shown in the pages concluding his forthcoming History of Bulgarian Literature, Chapter 4). Such a study would reveal the stage literally and metaphorically across which a whole variety of foreign influences entered 20th century Bulgarian literature, while not ignoring the native tradition of 19th century Bulgarian dramaturgy created especially in the provinces long before the conception and creation of the Sofia National Theatre (I refer to the historical drama tradition dating from Vasil Drumev's Ivanko and that of the comedie de moeurs going back to Iliya Bluskov's Krivorazbranata tsivilizatsiya).

But for genre research, I would also recommend the prose of this period especially because it has been overshadowed by the writers' then more dominant devotion to poetry, and I would suggest that such research began from rather than ended with Vazov, Strashimirov, Stamatov, and Elin Pelin (on the prose of whom some work has by now been done). I refer to areas of prose less spectacular, yet important enough (particularly in their content and also often in their style), to the development of contemporary literature. For, this period saw the first full blossoming of the modern Bulgarian literary and critical essay and also of the satirical and political feuilleton: I would cite here the work of Slaveykov, Krustev, Angelov, Minchev, Marinopolski, Krinchev, Atanasov, also Vlaykov and especially Andreychin (an outstandinding essayist of this time), but there are many others often to be found still only on the pages of contemporary periodicals. There is also the attempt (in the Lyuben Karavelov and Chernyshevsky-Herzen tradition) at the social novel, witness A. Ludogorov's (Sakuzov's) Iz tesninite on the 1906 railwaymen's strike and St. Veneyamin's (=Velchev's) Tsvetya iz snezhnata prolet and also, (if I dare mention it in the same breath) the "sensational street" prose Angelov so strongly warned against in his essays. Most interesting of all is perhaps the beginning of the genre of the prose-poem and of prose diary-impressions, notably in the work of Cheren, Popdimitrov and again Andreychin. Lastly, such a study of the prose genre of our period should include the memoir literature whether written then in it, like Bluskov and Gruev, Spomeni, or of it later by participants in the literary period, like K. Konstantinov, Radev or, more immediately, Marinopolski's Proyasneni khorizonti: spomeni i priznaniya (1922).

I cannot end these suggestions for further work to be done on this Bulgarian literary period without drawing attention to two categories of contributors to that literature both deserving fuller study and both concerned, again, with less well-known yet not insignificant literary figures of the time: namely women-writers and 'levichari' or leftwing litterateurs. Though pre-World War I Bulgarian literature seems to have been too early for anyone of the female literary stature of a Bagryana or a Blaga Dimitrova, we find here the first serious beginnings of such a literary contribution already in the poetry of Dora Gabe, Ekaterina Nencheva and especially of Slaveykov's great friend, (Minister Belchev's widow and a Bulgarian translator of Nietzsche), Mara Belcheva. Vazov's literary friend and protegee, Evgeniya Mars, should also be mentioned here. One cannot help observing, however, the exclusively male nature of literary coteries and groupings of this time; even among the Bulgarian symbolist bohema, women are conspicuously absent from what was noticeably a literary confrerie (however intensely present they may seem - like Yavorov's Lora Karavelova, or Boyadzhiev's and Debelyanov's loves - to have been as objects of devotion and inspiration in this pre-World War I Bulgarian poetry). So, though such "women's liberation" ideas as Lyuben Karavelov had preached in the mid-19th century were being consolidated by the ibsenisation we have noted, the application of these ideas to any active participation in Bulgarian literary life did not yet at this time extend appreciably further, it seems, than those two interesting leftwing ladies, Ana Karima and Viktoria Zhivkova, the former being the wife of the "broad" Obshto delo socialist Yanko

Sakuzov while the latter married Blagoev whence she acquired her nom de plume, Vela Blagoeva. Both edited or actively helped to edit periodicals and both wrote stories and other prose works, Ana Karima being particularly prolific and worthy of study.

Finally, Western scholars should never, I think, allow the Bulgarian leftwing literary movement of this period to become the preserve of contemporary East European Marxist critics and historians who must (it seems to me), by the very fact of their jealous custodianship of this heritage, be always here handicapped by very much the kinds of bias that are built into children in their critical assessment of their parents! Honesty should require our Marxist colleagues to welcome the completely uncommitted critical approach which Western scholars can and should bring to bear on this subject, because if they don't, it's hard to know who else will! In this respect then, I have kept till last what I consider the most vital and virgin area for work remaining to be done by Western, including, of course American scholars. Nor is this, even despite a certain aesthetic mediocrity and an often tedious enough tendentiousness, such an uninteresting area for the literary historian. If nothing else, it affords a literary laboratory to analyse how and why a Marxist or "pseudo-Marxist approach seems to work fairly well for the decorative arts and for mediocrities, .. but artists (or writers) of real talent always seem to slip through the net and swim away in the opposite direction!" Lord Clarke referring to West European art of our period (on p. 340 of "Civilisation" the book-transcript of his television lectures) describes in these words perfectly just what such bigger Bulgarian literary fish as Yavorov, Todorov, Andreychin and others all in fact exactly did! Secondly, the area of leftwing writing has its own intrinsic interest for its form of perpetuating the strong functionalist utilitarian tradition of Bulgarian literature: for its own style of reflecting contemporary society (from the Dickensian "critical-realist" approach) and also particularly for the considerable interest of its own family quarrels and the literary repercussions of the broad versus narrow, Obshto delo versus Novo vreme antagonism. Moreover, its periodicals (other than this last extremist one) shared the eclecticism of this literary period to the extent of publishing a range of meritorious writers of a quite evident "bourgeois" status: even that paradoxical old conservative Mikhaylovski made a point of contributing to Obshto delo and, later, also to Bakalov's Suvremennik; and he was welcomed in both in the manner typical of this then leftwing eclecticism and its pleasantly broadminded attempt to appreciate literary quality. Nor are the individual literary figures here to be neglected. To the two Bulgarian leftwing literary ladies we have mentioned I add their husbands Sakuzov and Blagoev, P. Deliradev, D. Polyanov, G. Kirkov and that viprous literary patron of the left, Georgi Bakalov, author of the controversial Bulgarskata literatura i sotsializmut (1911), who one day after World War I rounded on the then young 'symbolist', Khristo Mindov with these words

> You've come on a lot but you're still in your work for ever moaning, groaning and sighing like a sick man in a sanatorium. Not just you, but all our poetry seems to be pure sanatorium poetry these days. Just endless sorrow, sadness, endless funereal feelings. I don't fancy it, I really don't. What we need is lively, buoyant poetry, poetry of life, strong, resilient, redolent of the earth and factory chimneys (no pollution for Bakalov to worry about then!). Enough of all this quest for rare peculiar sensations, strange experiences and wishy-washy thoughts, enough of all this heartrending melancholy, enough of the hopelessness and sorrow. And unless you turn over a new leaf, I'll not accept one work of yours in my Borba! Andreychin and Dimitur Babev can have you, with my love!

Bakalov and his socialist colleagues of this time were "characters" and could repay detailed study by Western scholars of their literary personalities, views and works: these men (it will be found) can speak for themselves and their images have tended only to suffer from Marxist doctrinal PRO work. They need to be rescued!

I am sure I have not covered everything in these suggestions for further work on this Bulgarian literary period (and I look forward to your commenting on them and also adding to them), but I hope I have said enough to justify the application also to Western and American scholars viewing this area of Bulgarian literary scholarship of A. H. Clough's lines which Churchill quoted at the time of the World War II Second Front:

And not by Eastern windows only
when daylight comes, comes in the light.
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
but Westward, look the land is bright.

(from "Say not the struggle nought
availeth"
by Arthur Hugh Clough (1819-61))

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Paper by Professor Pinto

LORD: The paper was full of very good quotations and provided a wonderful survey of the time. A few ides to think about: What is the role of the epic? Slaveykov's epic poetry appears as a continuation of Vazov's. What is the effect of Slaveykov's poetry?
PINTO: Slaveykov was determined to write such poetry successfully. Radev claimed that such poetry was out of date, but Slaveykov paid no heed to this. He stemmed from the classical tradition as mediated by German romanticism.
LORD: What role did Todorov play in Bulgarian symbolism?
PINTO: His poetic prose contributed to the movement.
PUNDEFF: I agree with Prof. Lord that the paper was very good. However, it seems to me that it does not give sufficient note to the socialist movement.
PINTO: I shall take up this matter later.
MOSER: Where the recommendations for further research are concerned, we must remember that we do not have extensive possibilities for publication. Some of the topics Prof. Pinto mentions might conceivably serve as a stimulus for articles, but if we were to think of writing entire books with a chance of publication, what topics would you suggest?
PINTO: I have mentioned such things as an anthology with translations, or the editing of texts, or a combination of anthology and history of Bulgarian literature. This is the sort of thing which has a chance of being accepted on the commercial market. And it is also important to produce articles on topics in Bulgarian literature.
LORD: Can we devise a way to include studies of Bulgarian literature with other studies, for example of Shakespeare? Could we not do stylistic studies which would be comparative but include Bulgarian literature?
BYNUM: We are rather cut off from the sources, but Bulgarian literature offers us extraordinary opportunities because of its links with Russia, France and Germany. Bulgarian literature is unusual in its reliance upon peasant and folklore themes. Some of Bulgarian literature was a reaction to the internationalist character of symbolism. Compare the relations between Vazov and Slaveykov. Bulgarian literature has connections with the urban literature of Europe. The Bulgarians were involved in the political and literary life of Europe. One might write a history of Bulgarian literature against a background of cultural history.
PINTO: Unless one were careful not to be carried away by national and social themes, this could turn into a history of ideas. It would be better to concentrate on literature for itself.
BYNUM: Do you think such a method would be illegitimate?
PINTO: Marxist scholars indulge in it all the time.
BYNUM: Yes, but their interpretations are often wrong.
PINTO: Many figures in the history of Bulgarian literature still deserve examination. Andreychin, for instance, is little known but is worth investigation from the point of view of his social

background. I am very interested in Sofia cafe life, where a great deal of literary activity went on. But this is still a social aspect to literature.

PUNDEFF: It would be desirable to have a monograph dealing with literary criticism over restricted periods. A monographic study of Dimitur Blagoev as a literary critic would be very revealing, especially since many of his opinions are rejected by contemporary Bulgarian critics.

PINTO: True, we should not leave things like this entirely in the hands of the Bulgarians. We should write what we believe to be the truth without worrying about whether we may be denied a visa the next time we wish to visit Bulgaria.

Bulgarian Poetry 1918-1944

by

Edward Możejko
University of Alberta

Almost forty years ago in an article entitled "Der Kanon der bulgarischen Literatur" the brilliant Bulgarian literary historian and critic, Professor M. Arnaudov asked, not without a bit of irony, "what is to be considered the canon of Bulgarian literature"? He complained of the complete lack of unanimity among Bulgarians as to whom they should recognize as the most eminent Bulgarian writer.

"When every well-educated German, Frenchman, and Englishman can say with certainty which names of the past represent the poetical genius of his own nation, which epochs delineate the development of the poetical genius of his nation and who among his contemporaries are to be recommended for the prime consideration of a reader, it would be difficult to find two well-educated Bulgarians who could agree with each other upon designation of the exemplary 'canons' or even meritorious Bulgarian writers of the last sixty or seventy years".[1]

The author did not use the word 'canon' in the sense of a rule or a program which determines the essence of a certain idea or an artistic school. He used it in the sense of a certain value and creative originality of a literary work of art which found recognition in a certain cultural milieu and became recognized as "classical" in the literature of at least one nation.

The answer given by Arnaudov may not entirely satisfy the contemporary reader, but the questions touched upon in "Der Kanon der bulgarischen Literatur" are still topical today. Why, for example, are Englishmen or Frenchmen able to identify the most prominent writers in the history of their national literature, while Bulgarians differ so widely about their own poets and writers? Did nature bestow upon Bulgarians particularly cantankerous and contentious characters? Arnaudov is writing about the difficulties of establishing the canon of 19th and early 20th Century Bulgarian literature. It is even more difficult to do so for modern Bulgarian literature. The scholar who undertakes this task labors under the disadvantage of having no due historical perspective with respect to the events and phenomena he wishes to analyze. Therefore his results must be treated with reservations as not representing a final verdict but rather an attempt to find more adequate solutions.

---

[1] M. Arnaudov, "Der Kanon der bulgarischen Literatur", Slavische Rundschau, 1937, vol. VII, p. 223.

The point from which all critical discussions on Bulgarian letters ought to be launched is the recognition of the simple fact that in somewhat less than one hundred years this literature has gone through a course of development unique within the European frame of reference. This uniqueness consists in passing during a relatively short period of time through all stages of development known to other European countries under the name of great cultural movements: Renaissance, Classicism, Romanticism and Realism. What Europe achieved in the course of centuries became condensed in Bulgaria within the compass of decades. The leading and most active personalities of the Bulgarian intelligentsia wanted to shorten the distance separating Bulgaria from the rest of Europe and this fact has left a characteristic imprint on the entire development of Bulgarian literature in the 19th and 20th Centuries.

One can hardly speak about clearly differentiated literary trends in the history of Bulgarian literature apart from, perhaps, Symbolism. The period of the Vuzrazhdane (the Bulgarian Renaissance) combined elements of the 18th with those of the 19th Century: Classicism with Romanticism, Realism with Sentimentalism, Romanticism with Realism, and so on, and so on. Not only did these trends appear side by side in the literary production of individual writers, but they were often intertwined in single works. Thus the question "Was Vazov a realist or a romantic?" would be fully justified.

This state of affairs in Bulgarian letters did not, of course, favour the establishment of either solid criteria of aesthetic evaluation or the steady and irrefutable "canons" of which M. Arnaudov wrote. Constant fluctuation in the literary ethic, the seeking of inspiration in different traditions - these did not make it easier to consolidate in the national consciousness firm, resolved artistic values, and an unshakeable sense as to who might be recognized as the great national literary figure. This feverishness and haste in seeking stable, enduring ideological and artistic values also characterize, though in different form and under changed circumstances, the Bulgarian literature of today. However, despite an element of eclecticism, both Symbolism and the literature between the two World Wars managed to adjust their rhythm of development to that of Europe. One can clearly perceive in this literature glimmers of independence and originality. If the 19th Century was a period of national revival, then the 20th became a period of maturation in all realms of social, economic and cultural activity. In literature, this manifested itself in the rise of Symbolism as a clearly defined literary movement, and in the appearance of strong, creative personalities whose literary achievements cannot be ignored. However, it seems justifiable to recognize the period between the two World Wars during which a second generation of writers nurtured in an independent Bulgaria came to the fore, as the most provocative in the history of Bulgarian literature. Unlike their predecessors, they were not obsessed by the problems of national revival. This generation developed a much more independent and critical relationship to its European contemporaries, a certain distaste for metaphysical speculation, and a more modern perception of a peculiarly Bulgarian folkloristic tradition than did the Symbolists who preceded it.

As in other countries the caesura which separated the new literature of Bulgaria from Symbolism and 19th Century Realism or Naturalism is World War I. Of course, some faint symptoms of an avant-garde trend were perceptible before 1914, but the war accelerated the creative process and gave it a somewhat more radical, impetuous, vehement character. World War I with all its horrors and atrocities brutally shocked the human conscience, evoking a new sensibility and a desire for a more radical resolution of social conflicts.

This young generation of writers invoked its protest against "traditional solutions" mainly in anti-war themes and in the revolutionary motifs of expressionistic poetry. Many of these authors were at one time or another authors in the vanguard of socialist or anarchistic movements.

In spite of the despondency that seized the Bulgarian people after the lost war and the attendant loss of considerable territory, we observe an amazing resurgence in literature. In the course of three years three literary journals were founded, Vezni (1919-1922), Zlatorog (1920-1944) and Hyperion (1921-1931). These journals made the debut of many young writers possible and played an important role in shaping Bulgarian literature between the two World Wars.

However, we should stress at once that Bulgarian literature after the First World War did not develop exclusively under the banner of new, modern programs and the slogans of the rising generation. A distinctive feature of this period was a large number of older writers of varying artistic experience who also took their place in the literary process. In prose, T. Vlajkov, one of the most important representatives of Bulgarian "narodnichestvo"and by the same token a perpetuator of the 19th century tradition, was publishing new stories and working on the memoirs - Prezhivjanoto - which undoubtedly represent the best literary achievement of his life. Another fiction-writer, Elin Pelin, prepared the first edition of his Zemja, which depicted the decline of patriarchal relationships in Bulgarian villages. In the 1930's he published his humoristic sketches and short stories Az, ti, toj, and Pod monastirskata loza, a collection of novelettes full of biological verve but not devoid of philosophical undertones. Also, J. Jovkov's narrative talent developed and reached its maturity. From the end of World War I until his death in 1937 Jovkov wrote his best compositions, idealizing the simple quality of Bulgarian peasant life in Zhetvarjat, Chiflikut kraj granitsata, Staroplaninski legendi, Vecheri v Antimoviskija khan, Zhensko surtse, Ako mozhekha da govorjat. G. Stamatov continued to criticize, in his short stories, the existing social order, human hypocrisy and petty-bourgeois morality. G. Rajchev remained faithful to a psychological prose reminiscent of Dostojevsky but his later writings became permeated by a somewhat more lyrical tone as discernible in the novel Pesen na gorata and in Gospodinut s momicheto. Symbolism in prose continued to be represented by Nikolaj Rajnov,who tried to implement his theory of decorative style in prose in a construction of characters such that, instead of concrete features, they would embody abstract philosophical and religious ideas. The urban milieu and the life of the upper echelons of society are described respectively, in the works of Konstantin Konstantinov and Dimitur Shishmanov. Whereas Konstantinov could impress the reader with his high literary culture, and his subtle, refined, and clear style, Shishmanov, in his novels - (Deputat Stojanov, Khajlajf) - provided a more truthful, although artistically less perfect picture of high society. The historical novel found its most brilliant representative in Stojan Zagorchinov, whose Den posleden and Legenda na sv. Sofija will remain as enduring achievements in the history of Bulgarian literature. Chavdar Mutafov (Diletant, Marionetki) and Vladimir Poljanov (Dete, Smurt) were obviously under the influence of European avant-garde prose, especially Expressionism. It turned out, however, that among this group of writers the most talented was Svetoslav Minkov. He belongs to the trend in European literature represented by writers such as E.T.A. Hoffmann, H.G. Wells, and Aldous Huxley. Back of his mysticism, his satire and his preoccupation with the fantastic (e.g. Avtomati) is hidden a deep concern for the preservation of human values against the onslaught of technological civilization. The picture of Bulgarian prose would be incomplete were we not to mention the names of A. Karalijchev, I. Volen, and G. Karaslavov. Unlike their peers, they seek inspiration in a national and folkloristic literary tradition and concentrate their attention on the problems of peasant life. Whereas the prose of A. Karalijchev and I. Volen is marked by a more lyrical and contemplative approach to outer reality and gives a poetical picture of the Bulgarian village, G. Karaslavov strikes us with the severity of his realism in novels such as Snakha and Tatul.

In comparison with prose, dramatic literature-playwriting, dramaturgy - is less well developed. Only a few plays from this period are likely to remain in the repertoire of the Bulgarian theatre. Of those that come to mind there are first of all J. Jovkov's plays - Albena, Borjana, Milionerut - R. Stojanov's drama, Majstori, and the comedies of St. L. Kostov - Zlatnata mina and Golemanov.

Among the three traditionally recognized genres of literature - poetry, prose and drama - poetry undoubtedly played a leading, even a dominant, role in the literary process of the 1920's and 1930's. This should not come as a surprise if we take into account the historical conditions of literary development in Bulgaria. Like short stories, poetry in Bulgaria also grew out of folklore and consequently had behind it a continuity of historic development, with centuries of artistic experience handed down by unknown authors of folkloric tales and songs. The characteristic brevity of both stories and poems as a literary form facilitated their oral transmission from generation to generation. In the 19th century the richness and variety of Bulgaria's folklore became a treasure from which all her writers profited. It is not by accident that already in the 19th century poets of the stature of Botev and Vazov emerged, to be followed at the beginning of the 20th century by the unusual narrative talent of Elin-Pelin. Both novel and drama - on the other haad - had permanently "to catch up with the lyrics and epos of folklore".[2]

The lyrics of the generation which dedicated itself to literature after the First World War was not only anti-symbolistic but in a way also a continuation of the best tradition of Bulgarian poetry as a whole. It seems strange that very little attention has been paid to it by historians and critics of literature in Bulgaria. In the past fifteen years of its existence Literaturna misul, the central organ of the Bulgarian Literary Institute in Sofia, has devoted only two articles to E. Bagrjana, one article to N. Furnadzhiev, one to A. Dalchev, and one to G. Milev. No doubt the general intellectual atmosphere that has reigned in Bulgaria since 1944 did not favour an objective evaluation of literature. Ideological correctness, not the artistic value of literary works, has been accepted as almost the sole criterion of criticism. A critic had to look for those literary elements which contributed to the cause of socialist revolution. This led, of course, to an erroneous classification of many poets, to either an overestimation of some second-rate writers or to an undeserved underestimation and down-grading of some very interesting ones. In general this methodological approach resulted in a badly distorted picture of the poetry written between the two World Wars. Since 1956 the same Literaturna misul has published five articles about the work of Khr. Smirnenski and none about that of A. Raztsvetnikov - an exception is one short biographical piece by G. Konstantinov. In the past few years this situation has somewhat changed and the interests of critics have veered toward neglected poets. The methodological tenets of their criticism, however, still remain one-sided and obsolete.

The major basic work on Bulgarian poetry of the 1920's and 1930's is R. Likova's book Za njakoi osobenosti na bulgarskata poezija 1923-1944.[3] The author has assembled abundant factual material, without omitting a single name of importance to the poetry of this period. Anyone will find in her book many details and interesting commentary on the poetry of Bagrjana, Dalchev, Furnadzhiev. There are apt observations of a general character too, but altogether the fundamental methodological premise of this book seems to be erroneous and unacceptable. Its main theme consists in the treatment of the entire poetical development of this period as a predetermined evolution from decadentism, aesthetism and individualism to realism. Where this thesis does not work or cannot be applied fully the author avoids an honest evaluation of some poems or whole periods of a poet's creative effort (e.g. A. Raztsvetnikov) and dismisses the problem with a few remarks, usually expressing regret that such and such a poet did not succeed in preserving the proper ideological stance.

---

[2] Ibid. p. 231

[3] R. Likova, Za njakoi osobenosti na bulgarskata poezija 1923-1944, Sofia, 1962, p. 395

Likova starts her analysis with the year 1923. Khr. Smirnenski is not taken into consideration, but loose references made to his poems leave no doubt that she takes him for the originator of the new poetry.[4] His alleged "successors" on the other hand, are discussed in detail: Nikola Furnadzhiev, Asen Raztsvetnikov, and Geo Milev, who have been labelled as "poets of Septemvri" (Septemvrijskata poezija - the name derived from the September uprising of 1923). It is difficult to agree with such an interpretation. Collections of poems edited by N. Furnadzhiev and A. Raztsvetnikov after 1923 were only an episode in their creative output and it would be a misjudgement to separate them into one poetical group on the basis of a single political event. As far as G. Milev is concerned it is necessary to emphasize that because of his completely different artistic credo it would be, to put it charitably, unreasonable to lump him together with N. Furnadzhiev and A. Raztsvetnikov. When we draw lines between different tendencies in Bulgarian poetry of 1917-1944 it is worthwhile to note that Likova recognizes only political factors as decisive criteria for such a classification and disregards the literary ones. Thus we have poets of September, poets-humanists, poets of Socialist Realism and the poetry of World War II. Furthermore, according to Likova, all major changes in literature were evoked only by great political and social events and poetry ceased to exist as an autonomous form of art.

An even more rigid and schematic approach towards the poetry of the 1930's was taken by Ludmil Stojanov, the former Symbolist, who is now a major spokesman for the official cultural policy in Bulgaria. For him no other poetry than the revolutionary exists.[5] According to Stojanov even E. Bagrjana and A. Dalchev took up revolutionary themes although, in fact, they have never written a single revolutionary poem. Stojanov has simply lost his sense of responsibility and proportion: he has given a highly non-objective, if not completely distorted, picture of Bulgarian poetry in the 1930's. The distortion inherent in his stressing of only selected aspects of Bulgarian poetry pertains to particular poets as well as to the period as a whole. For example, Stojanov devotes much more attention to the poems of Nikolaj Khrelkov and Mladen Isaev than to Nikola Vaptsarov - one of the greatest talents of his generation.

---

[4] In another book: Bulgarskata beletristika mezhdu dvete vojni 1918-1944, Sofia, 1965, p. 18, Likova writes as follows: "Javlenie, koeto dade oblik na epokhata, koeto prevurna vremeto sled Oktomvrijskata revolutsija v nov etap ot razvitieto na nashata literatura, e pojavata na Smirnenski i tvorchestvoto na tezi, koito tvorjakha zaedno s nego - D. Poljanov, Kr. Kjuljavkov, sutrudnitsite na Cherven smjakh, Novo vreme i Rabotnicheski vestnik - A. Karalijchev, As. Raztsvetnikov, Khr. Jasenov i dr."

[5] L. Stojanov, "Revolutsionnata poezija na trijsette godini" in: Literaturna misul, 1962, no. 2, pp. 58-93.

To the more comprehensive recent works on Bulgarian poetry belongs also that of the Soviet slavist D.F. Markov: Bolgarskaja poezija pervoj chetverti XX veka,[6] translated into Bulgarian in 1961. In the last three chapters of his book Markov discusses Bulgarian poetry of the period 1918-25. The author correctly indicated a clear shift to the left in the ideological attitude of many writers. At the same time, however, he gives a very primitive estimation of the Expressionism represented by G. Milev. Markov remains caught in the traps of vulgar sociological method and schematism when he evaluates the art of Expressionists and their concept of "spiritual revolution" as "reactionary principles of 'pure art'".

One could, of course, refer to the titles of more articles devoted to the Bulgarian poetry of the period 1918-1944, but all of them are written from the positions of sociological method or Marxist criticism, and often they have the vice of monotony and one-sidedness. Moreover, their authors show little regard for the artistic values inherent in this poetry.

Unfortunately one is hard put to say anything laudatory about the work of slavists in the West either - probably because of a lack of interest in Bulgarian literature in general. Apart from a perceptive article published by D. Statkov in the Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie[7] on Dalchev, one can find a little information about Bulgarian poets of the inter-war period (1918-1944) in three textbooks of Bulgarian literature: George Hateau's Litterature bulgare,[8] L. Borriero Picchio's Storia della letteratura bulgara[9] and Modern Bulgarian Literature by C.A. Manning and R. Smal-Stocki.[10]

Hateau's textbook contains the most concrete and factual information. This French author seems to have been well acquainted with literary production in the Bulgaria of the 1920's. As for the Italian textbook, one can say that if, for example, R. Likova applies political criteria only in order to classify writers, then L. Borriero Picchio goes to another extreme and utilizes some well-known literary labels which do not seem always to fit the factual content of Bulgarian literature. Picchio does not separate the years from 1918-1944 into an independent period but simplifies the whole problem by dividing all Bulgarian poets of the twentieth century into three major groups:

---

[6] D.F. Markov, Bolgarskaja poezija pervoj chetverti XX v., Moscow. 1959, pp 286. Bulgarian translation: 1961

[7] D. Statkov, "Atanas Dalcev's poetische Welt" in: Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie, 1969, Band XXIV, Heft 2, pp. 254-276.

[8] G. Mateau, Litterature bulgare, Paris, 1937, p. 165.

[9] Lavina Borriero Picchio, Storia della letteratura bulgara, Milan, 1957, p. 279

[10] C. Manning and R. Smal-Stocki, The History of Modern Bulgarian Literature, New York, 1960, p. 198.

Symbolists, Futurists and proletarian poets. However, if anybody would like to find out who belongs to the Futurists he would have difficulties in satisfying his curiosity from Picchio's book. If the above-mentioned authors have, in our judgment, failed to provide an acceptable classification of Bulgarian poets between the two World Wars let us propose a better one. We do not think that the scheme set out below is flawless, but we are convinced that it can lead to more satisfactory solutions.

For the period between the two World Wars it seems appropriate to speak of four basic tendencies in Bulgarian poetry. We would like to underscore the word "tendencies", for it is difficult indeed to speak of clearly differentiated and established literary groupings in Bulgarian poetry during that time. Having made this reservation, we can say that in Bulgarian poetry after 1918 four major tendencies were present:

a. Symbolism
b. The poetry of the avant-garde which was under the influence of the new currents - mainly Expressionism - in European literature.
c. In the third group we include the work of those poets whose works are rooted in the national tradition and who have employed the folkloric experience in a modern way. Although this does not exclude some foreign influence we consider them to be most original and successful in their efforts to revive Bulgarian poetry as such.
d. The fourth group constitutes the work of the so-called proletarian poets who were tied in with the communist movement.

Let us now undertake a more detailed survey of the four tendencies in Bulgarian poetry which we have just identified.

****

If in other European countries the end of World War I coincided with the dissolution of Symbolism, in Bulgaria it demonstrated an unexpected vitality. The new periodical Hyperion, founded in 1921 by T. Trajanov and L. Stojanov, served as a gathering point for both older and younger Symbolists. In its pages the literary elite of Bulgaria - T. Trajanov, L. Stojanov, N. Liliev, and Em. P. Dimitrov representing the older, J. Stubel, At. Dalchev, D. Panteleev and Fr. Mirchev the younger generation - presented their new compositions. In the course of barely three years the important collections of symbolist poetry: Ptitsi v noshtta (1919) and Lunni petna (1922) by N. Liliev, Ritsarski zamuk (1921) by Khr. Jasenov, and Bulgarski baladi (1921) by T. Trajanov also appeared. In 1920 K. Konstantinov published the collected poems of D. Debeljanov, a promising young poet who was killed in 1916. Most of the poetry in these collections had been published earlier in various literary journals and periodicals. The fact, however, that they all appeared as collected works within a very short period of time has significance - it means that the symbolists did not intend to give up the position they had gained before 1914, and during the war.

Among the poets mentioned special attention should be given to Nikolaj Liliev (1884-1960). His subtly shaded lyrics are considered by many Bulgarian critics to be the culminating achievement of Bulgarian Symbolism. The leitmotif of his poetry is solitude. It would probably be difficult to find a poet who so systematically has, so to say, "depopulated" his poetry. The poetic "I" in his poems is surrounded only by nature and by a certain elusive, as it were, space. The only being to whom the poet directs his attention and confines his concerns is God. The poetic world of Liliev, built up of immaterial elements, is rendered unreal. A few excerpts may serve to illustrate this feature:

Моите спомени,
птици в нощта,
скитат бездомни,
скитат унесени
вън от света.

Моите песни,
сенки без път
блесват нечути
в скръбната есен - и
пак замълчат.

Or the following stanzas:

Жената, която от паметни дни
сърцето ми пламенно страстно обича,
живее в незнайни, далечни страни
и Ничия Никога тя се нарича.
....
Тя люби потайния приказен мир,
потънал в мъглите на здрачна далечност -
и в нейния поглед - планински тих вир -
оглежда се мълком безмълвната вечност.

As in the last two stanzas, in other poems as well the motif of love remains in Liliev's poetry an abstract, vague feeling, without clearly outlined objects. The most frequent attributes of the lyrical situation are: autumn, night, the moon. This background creates a special atmosphere for emotional tensions, inner experience, irresolutions, despair, glimmers of hope which are usually expressed either by the lyrical subject or by the personification of nature and allegory. The daydreams and melancholy which characterize Liliev's poetry are usually presented as an emanation of nature. However, under the poet's brush the universe takes on an exceptional diversity and richness of feelings, colors and forms: at the one pole - dawn, sunrise, the sun itself symbolize life, at the other - the moon, dusk, starry sky express contrition, sorrow, resignation, weariness.[11] Seldom is nature an independent motif in the poetry of Liliev.

---

[11] G. Konstantinov writes more on this subject in his introduction to Liliev's collected works: Suchinenija v.I, Stikhotvorenija, Sofia, 1964, p. 12.

Besides these typically symbolistic motifs, the poetry of Liliev also evinces some modern tones. His composition "Gradut", aside from D. Debeljanov's "Spi gradut", is probably the first poem about a contemporary city in Bulgarian poetry. The changing rhythm of this poem expresses a differentiated scale of feelings and reflections: fear, loneliness of the individual in the modern city; its awakening in the morning, noise, the march of the mob, and compassion for its way of existence.

There is not enough space in this paper to give a detailed analysis of all the artistic values that Liliev's poetry possesses. We feel, however, that it is essential to emphasize that, because of its melodic character, because of the richness of rhythm and intonation, we should recognize this poetry as the epitome of Bulgarian Symbolism. Liliev is especially sensitive to sound, and thus the abundance of repetitions, alliterations and consonances in his work. It seems that in his poetry the full potential inherent in Symbolism has been exhausted. Attempts to continue beyond this type of symbolist poetry could only end in epigonism. It is small wonder that after 1925, when new literary currents came to the fore, Symbolism seemed a clear anachronism. Ivan Radoslavov's assertions as to the superiority of Symbolism over other literary currents were little more than bombast without foundation.

The first reaction against Symbolism came from the most unexpected source: from Symbolism itself. In 1919 Geo Milev founded the literary periodical _Vezni_. At first it promised to be another tribune for Symbolism. As a matter of fact it was during its first year, during which it enjoyed the support of a number of symbolists. Its title encouraged such cooperation since it obviously referred to _Vesy_, the literary organ of the Russian Symbolists. Moreover, Milev himself aroused confidence: his record as a man of letters left no doubt that he was following the path of Symbolism. He had repeatedly declared that the foundation of every great art was extreme subjectivism. Two or three poems in a realistic style could not blur the whole picture. During a sojourn in Berlin Milev entered the group of German expressionists who published the journal _Aktion_. The effect on Milev's artistic attitude was quickly apparent in _Vezni's_ abrupt withdrawal from its old Symbolist position, followed by a clear declaration of support for Expressionism. Ljudmil Stojanov accused his younger friend of being a traitor and publicly severed his ties with _Vezni_.

When we speak of Bulgarian Expressionism it is necessary to exercise restraint in the estimation of the scope of its effect on literature. Only three or four writers seriously endeavoured to transplant the Expressionist trend in Bulgarian literature: in poetry G. Milev and Lamar; in prose Chavdar Mutafov. Consequently it would be a mistake to apply European standards and maintain that Expressionism in Bulgaria in the 1920's had become a dominant literary trend. It would be more correct to speak of an episode of Expressionism, of the existence of expressionistic elements in Bulgarian literature. Nevertheless, the role which Milev played as the most active exponent of Expressionism in Bulgarian literature was of considerable importance: his enthusiasm for experimentation paved the way for new avant-garde tendencies in Bulgarian literature.

The first collection of poems by Milev (1895-1925), Zhestokijat prusten, appeared in 1920 and had a clearly symbolist imprint. Perhaps only two poems: "Kazhi: Vnezapno da izcheznesh" and "Glavata mi - kurvav fener" show a certain affinity with the aesthetic tenets of Expressionism - the first one because of the desire expressed by the lyrical subject to vanish in the crowd, and the second - "Glavata mi - kurvav fener" - because of its intention to shock the reader with its unusual imagery. Both poems depart from Symbolism in their preoccupation with everyday life and current events and in the willingness of the poet to grasp as many experiences as possible. This is especially evident in "Glavata mi - kurvav fener"

Главата ми -
        кървав фенер с разтрошени стъкла,
загубен през вятър и дъжд, и мъгла
в полунощни поля.
Аз умирам под кота 506
и възкръсвам в Берлин и Париж.
Няма век, няма час - има днес.

We have drawn attention to this fact because Bulgarian critics now claim that G. Milev underwent a sudden transition from Symbolism to Expressionism.[12] The above mentioned poems themselves, however, of which the first was written in 1915, and the second not later than 1919, argue for a gradual creative evolution from Symbolism to Expressionism - a phenomenon well known in other Slavic literatures of the time. In 1920 there appeared also a tiny collection of Milev's "poetic-prose" Ekspresjonistichno kalendarche. It amounted to a clear declaration in favor of the new trend. From now on Milev would not only pursue his struggle against Realism,[13] he would also take up the cudgels against the Symbolists. He remained faithful to the aesthetic principles of Expressionism also when he wrote his famous poem Septemvri, and indeed to the end of his life - a fact neglected by Marxist critics in Bulgaria. As the first expressionistic composition in Bulgarian literature Ekspresionistichno kalendarche is a set of lyrical pictures successively titled by the name of a month. In a series of poetic reflections Milev seems to sketch the conflicts of the contemporary world and to herald the arrival of a new era. Technological civilization will bring the ascendancy of the underprivileged, of the "black people" (not in the sense of the color of their skin but in the meaning of their social position), and will inevitably bring the revolution which will usher in the end of social unrest and inequality.

---

[12] G. Markov, "Geo Milev", in: Izbrani proizvedenija, Sofia, 1965, pp. 5-40.

[13] See also G. Milev's article "Protiv realizma" in Sluntse, vol. I, no. 5, and G. Markov's article, "Geo Milev prez perioda Vezni" in Literaturna misul, 1963, no. 5, pp. 60-87. Markov claims that Milev was a relentless enemy of realism.

Milev's literary output during the last period of his life was not extensive. It includes only the unfinished poems Ad and Den na gneva, and Septemvri. However, the poetics of these works must be recognized as typically expressionistic. Instead of symbolist melancholy and irresolution we find in them the glorification of action; instead of the individual there is the emergence of a new hero: the nameless masses. The whir of machines, the mutiny of the masses, the rhythm of revolutionary marches characterize the atmosphere of the new times. Milev wants to keep pace with this development. Yet we should emphasize that Milev never called for revolution from the position of a militant Marxist. His sympathy for the working classes was aroused more by humanitarian motives than by anything else. This assertion is valid also for Septemvri, in which Marxist critics in Bulgaria claim to find proof that Milev approached Marxism and Realism in poetry. There is probably nothing more erroneous than such an allegation. Both the content and the language of Septemvri leave little doubt that we are dealing with an expressionistic poem par excellence. In one hundred and eighty-eight words of the first part of Septemvri there occur only three verbs in the past tense, one infinitive, and no fewer than eighty-four nouns - a good illustration of the expressionistic technique for the conveying of dynamic projections of visionary thought. Besides, Milev abdicates the traditional composition of the epic poem by rejecting the role of plot. This leads us to the final conclusion that Milev was among the first to break with the traditional concepts of literature. We consider him one of the most interesting and provocative representatives of Expressionism in Slavic literatures.

A poet who in his artistic attitude occupied a position close to Milev was Lalu Marinov (pseudonym Lamar, born in 1898). The difference between the two consists mainly in the fact that Lamar was an apprentice of Symbolism for a much shorter time than Milev, and soon passed over to the avant-garde camp. Such a conversion in a relatively short period of time usually attests to either a lack of artistic stability, or else it occurs under the pressure of external circumstances which have little if anything to do with literature. A typical example of the latter metamorphosis was the poetry of Aleksandr Blok after the Bolshevik Revolution. In either case the concrete literary results tend to be poor because they do not grow out of sincere artistic experience. In Lamar's case the leap from Symbolism to Expressionism arose from a lack of definite creative tenets in a young writer searching for a new literary credo. The adoption of Expressionism or even of some elements of Futurism in Lamar's poetry came as a result of the search for new patterns in poetry; it resulted from his desire to be "modern". Hence a certain phoniness and posturing crept into his initial collection of poetry, published in 1922 under the title Arena. The poetic "I" exhibits an ironic and hostile attitude toward the outer world: this world is a circus and does not deserve anything better than annihilation. The lyrical subject often reminds the reader of a barbarian who, as it were, having found himself in the midst of a strange civilization, wants to destroy it. Hence this shocking apostrophe in his poem "Circus":

> Елате каналии овни виторози
> кози и магарета подли хиени
> аз имам овес и сено и метли даже рози
> и месо със лед и вина и изби студени.

Irony, revolt against stagnation, the glorification of motion are distinguishing features of Lamar's early poetry, and are characteristic of his second book, Zhelezni ikoni (1927). It was not until 1928 that his poetry reached maturity and a more peaceful, epic tonality. In his poem Mirni-razmirni godini we clearly feel a strong folklore influence. In other poems, published during the 1930's, Lamar's interests remained in the sphere of social and national themes. The poet was not preoccupied so much with revolution as he was obsessed with the changes caused by the development and consolidation of urban and technological civilization.[14] Lamar never joined either of the two opposing literary camps: that of the Communists or that of Zlatorog led by Vladimir Vasilev. He followed his own line in literature and edited the independent literary journals Novis and Probiv.

Both Milev and Lamar were poets who helped to deal the first major blow to the symbolist school. However, the real credit for the ultimate overthrow of Symbolism should be given to a third group of poets to which, in our opinion Nikola Furnadzhiev, Asen Raztsvetnikov, Elisaveta Bagrjana, and Atanas Dalchev belong. Let us, however, make the following reservation: these poets were never bound by any kind of common program or literary manifesto, they never formed a unified literary group. On the contrary, they were poets of diverse creative temperaments and poetical sensitivity. Each had his own, quite personal approach to literature. Bagrjana made her debut in the liberal journal Suvremenna misul (1915), Atanas Dalchev in the beginning of his literary career contributed to Hyperion; a little later he joined, together with D. Panteleev, the literary circle Strelets.[15] Furnadzhiev and Raztsvetnikov published their first poems under the auspices of Georgi Bakalov, the well-known Marxist critic and editor-in-chief of Nov put. Nonetheless, future historians of literature who approach the question: which Bulgarian poets contributed most to European poetry? will undoubtedly have to refer to the five names just mentioned.

---

14. Pencho Danchev has written a comprehensive study on Lamar as a preamble to Lamar's Izbrani proizvedenija, Sofia, 1955, pp. 5-39.

15. The literary group "Strelets" was composed of K. Gulubov, Chavdar Mutafov, I. Khadzhi Khristov, I. Mirchev, A. Iliev, D. Panteleev, A. Dalchev, G. Karaivanov, S. Minkov and Pancho Mikhajlov. The majority of these writers were oriented toward the West. Some of them, like K. Gulubov and C. Mutafov, sympathized with the Expressionists. Others vacillated between Symbolism and the new trends in literature.

When Furnadzhiev and Raztsvetnikov are discussed by Bulgarian critics, they usually appear side by side with Geo Milev. According to the official critical line these three poets constitute an independent, separate trend in Bulgarian literature - the so-called poetry of September ("Septemvrijskata poezija"). These critics simply disregard the fact that the first collections of Furnadzhiev's and Raztsvetnikov's poetry, quoted as examples of "Septemvrijskata poezija", constitute one third or less of their literary output, and represent only episodes in their artistic evolution. As far as Geo Milev is concerned, these critics have overlooked the fact that the artistic and ideological structure of his poetry is completely different from that of Furnadzhiev and Raztsvetnikov. Whereas Milev, in *Septemvri*, was a real revolutionary poet, one can hardly apply the adjective "revolutionary" to Furnadzhiev and Raztsvetnikov. In a review published in 1925[16] Ljudmil Stojanov subjected the first collections of Furnadzhiev's and Raztsvetnikov's poetry to severe criticism. This malicious attack was brought on by Stojanov's dislike for their anti-symbolist verse. However, it seems that on one point we should agree with his opinion: It is the question of the validity of the argument that Raztsvetnikov and Furnadzhiev were revolutionary poets. The answer to this justifiable doubt is quite simple: the term "revolutionary" was applied to both poets because of their brief relationship with Bakalov. Especially after 1944 this fact has been emphasized by the critics and considered adequate justification for calling both poets revolutionary.[17]

Let us now take a closer look at these two poets' writings. Furnadzhiev (1903-1968) published three collections of poetry between the two World Wars: *Proleten vjatur* (1924), *Duga* (1928), and *Stikhotvorenija* (1942). His initial book of poems, *Proleten vjatur*, is obviously permeated with the atmosphere of the tragic events of September 1923. However, to say that the newness of this poetry consists in its revolutionary character would be an inadmissible simplification, or even a departure from the truth. First of all we should bring to light the fact that in *Proleten vjatur* two opposite moods resound, as it were: a pessimistic and an optimistic one. Let us quote two examples, of which one is from the beginning, the other from the end of the book:

> Конници, конници, конници, кървави конници
> втурнати лудо под нашето родно небе...
> де е народа и де е земята бунтовница,
> де сме, о мое печално и равно поле?
> Там изгоряха селата и скърцат бесилките,
> вятърът стене на пустите ниви сега.
> Конници идат и плаче земята родилката,
> сякаш че плаче и пее, и иде смъртта.

---

[16] L. Stojanov, "Revolutsionna poezija /II/", in *Hyperion*, 1925, vol. IV, no. 4, pp. 211-219.

[17] An exception is Zdravko Petrov's article "Nikola Furnadzhiev", *Literaturna misul*, 1965, no. 3, pp. 3-35.

and:

Моя майко и моя кръщелнице,
полудяла и огнена пролет,
дето весело биеш в кепенците
и лудуваш над влажните клони.
Аз съм луд и аз язда през нивите,
аз по сивите улици тичам
и разправям на своите биволи
с колко нежна любов ги обичам.

Both poems have the characteristic feature of all Furnadzhiev's poetry, a dynamic rhythm. They are, however, completely different in their mood. Indeed, the majority of poems in Proleten vjatur, but especially those in the first part, are so constructed as to imply sorrow and tragedy. Yet in "Konnitsi" we find expressions like "pechalno pole", "plache zemjata", "ide smurtta" "cherveni prozortsi" and so on. In other poems the poetic vocabulary grows stronger and takes on an even more tragic tinge. The poet sees everything in black and red colors which symbolize death and struggle (e.g. "kurvavi diri", "cherna kruv"). The poetic images, which sometimes verge on surrealistic deformation, evoke horror, dread, grimness and approach the limits of suffering. Yet these poems express compassion for and solidarity with ordinary people, with those who are persecuted and oppressed. In the last instance, however, the poet looks at the September uprising as a national tragedy. There are no winners, there are only losers. Furnadzhiev fears that "neshto cherno e legnalo v putja ni", something which has divided the nation and created an abyss between those who are governed and those who govern.

Yet beyond these notes of sorrow and and despair one can find in this poetry motifs of optimism. They are indeed present from the very beginning, and they reverberate like a strange dissonance even in the most pessimistic poems. We can grasp this phenomenon only when we become aware of the role which the motif of "earth" plays in Proleten vjatur. The author, in almost every poem, extols the glory of earth, field and wind, but earth as a rule occupies the central position. If we are to judge Furnadzhiev as a poet in terms of social literary criticism, then it would be more correct to say that he came to literature not as a poet of revolution but as a poet of the Bulgarian village. We find in his early poems a typically rural cult of the earth-mother which is the source of life. From this cult stems the biological vitality rightly recognized by many critics as the most characteristic feature of Furnadzhiev's poetry. The source of vitality in Furnadzhiev's poems is not, let us repeat, ideology. It is an almost mythological "cult of earth". To understand this is to understand the optimism of his poetry. The words "earth", "field" are frequently interchanged with the"fatherland". In conjunction with the word "spring", the symbol of revival, "earth", the symbol of life, expresses the hope that after the nightmare of destruction, death and hatred the time of the "green light" will follow. Only this interpretation explains and justifies the title of the book, Proleten vjatur.

What is the novelty in Furnadzhiev's poetic debut? Obviously it lies in his rejection of the Symbolist poetics. The poetic world of Proleten vjatur's author is a real world, in which authentic passions are pitted against one another, where the lyrical subject does not refer to supernatural forces not understood by our senses. But not only in that: In the review mentioned above Stojanov criticizes Proleten vjatur, especially the second stanza:

Аз съм луд и аз язда през нивите,
аз по сивите улици тичам
и разправям на своите биволи
с колко нежна любов ги обичам.

Stojancv complains that he cannot understand the logic of a poem in which the lyrical hero is able to engage in so many activities at once - to drive through the field, to run in the streets and to tell the tuffaloes how he loves them. However, when we take a more comprehensive look at the question we realize that this technique of composition is not unique to Proleten vjatur or to Furnadzhiev's poetry alone. Its essence consists in the poet's eagerness to encompass as many events as possible in one stanza: it consists in his anxiety to infuse different levels of human activity into his poetic world so that the fetters of space, delineated by the plot in traditional poems, may be shed. We can find a similar stanzaic structure also in the poem "Vultsi", where we discern three parallel, simultaneous but independent activities:

Глутница вълци яростно се спуща.
Посевите в мъглите сиви сият
и ние със железните обуща
от ранина вървиме пак на път.

This reminds us a little bit of Milev's poem, quoted above: "Glavata mi - kurvav fener," where we read the following:

Аз умирам под кота 506
и възкръсвам в Берлин и Париж.

In speaking of this, another critic, K. Gulubov, argued that the poet should be allowed to do many things, but certainly not to violate the principles of logical construction of thought.

To be sure, the motif of earth and the fatherland appear also in the second volume of Furnadzhiev's poetry, Duga, but there it is devoid of the tragic dimension: the poet now seems to emphasize more his indissoluble ties with them. After becoming a contributor to Zlatorog Furnadzhiev changed his poetic attitude: his poetry lost its dynamism and was completely seized by pessimistic feelings. Great social and national problems do not inspire the poet anymore, and as a consequence the dramatic character of his poetry also diminishes, it becomes more serene. The poet confides his own internal worries and irresolutions, he doubts the usefulness of poetry. His poems of the late 1930's contain a clear element of catastrophism.

In conclusion one can say that the name of Furnadzhiev as a poet will probably be connected primarily with the 1920's, during which time the most significant facets of his poetical talent were developed.

In comparison with Furnadzhiev, Asen Raztsvetnikov (1887-1951) stood much closer, both in his poetry and private life, to the leftist movement. However, his creative writing can hardly be called revolutionary either. His poetic evolution is very reminiscent of Furnadzhiev's: first the connection with the Marxist periodical Nov put, then the transition to Zlatorog and the extreme pessimism of the thirties. However, there is one difference between the two: after the Second World War Furnadzhiev tried to reassert himself as a poet and established a "modus vivendi" with the new regime, something Raztsvetnikov never did. From 1944 until his death in 1951 Raztsvetnikov published only four short poems, all without artistic importance. In his early collection Zhertveni kladi (1924), Raztsvetnikov, by comparison with Furnadzhiev, more explicitly gives us to understand on which side his sympathies lie as far as the September uprising is concerned. Moreover, in his poetry of that time there is a perceptibly stronger influence of folklore and the poet's connection with the bucolic life of the village. This finds expression in the very strong presence of balladic and epic elements in Zhertveni kladi, in Mor (1924) and Zatvor (1924). Mor and Zatvor are political poems motivated by the atrocities committed by the authorities during the suppression of the revolt.

After 1925 Raztsvetnikov abandoned social motifs and his poetry took on a tone of deep pessimism caused by his complete alienation from the modern industrial world. We have said of Furnadzhiev that he entered literature as a poet of the Bulgarian village. This remark seems to be even more appropriate to Raztsvetnikov, who remained such to the end of his life. Raztsvetnikov's poetical world calls to mind the world of legends; the poet does not feel comfortable in surroundings of "concrete", "wire" and "steam". The poem "Mechtatel" sounds like a confession:

В тоя свят на парата и жиците
ето ме загубен без следа,
с мойта дива нежност във зениците
и в душата - с късче от звезда.

This sense of being lost, of pessimism and mistrust of man, runs like a red thread through all the collections of Raztsvetnikov's poetry after 1925 - Dvojnik (1927), Planinski vecheri (1934) and Stikhotvorenija (1942). In his poem Dvojnik the poet's embitterment is total:

> Не вярвам в човека, не вярвам в доброто, не вярвам в душата,
> не вярвам, че някога Бог е направил света.

Raztsvetnikov ceased to write completely after 1944, and confined himself to translations.

Among the foremost attainments of Bulgarian lyric verse between the two World Wars is the poetry of Elisaveta Bagrjana (born 1893). Both Bulgarian critics and foreign critics who are familiar with Bulgarian literature agree on this point. Reviews of Bagrjana's poems appeared long before her first book of poetry was published.[18] One year after the first edition of Vechnata i svjatata (1927) appeared, Ivan Meshekov devoted a whole book[19] to the young poetess. Bagrjana's lyrics today are considered classic. At the time of her literary debut, however, they shocked readers with their sincerity and pristine quality. As with all great poetry of the twentieth century, Bagrjana's verse mingles different styles, different systems of versification and various emotional moods. It is a poetry tuned to the tension between these elements of poetic technique. On occasion the author does not hesitate to introduce plot into a lyric poem, to introduce an epic element, and thus an event becomes a pretext for spinning out a lyrical or philosophical reflection.

By 1944 Bagrjana had published[20] three collections of poems: Vechnata i svjatata (1927), Zvezda na morjaka (1932), and Surtse choveshko (1936). It would be trite to say that in her first volume the poetess struggles for the emancipation of women, but there is something of the truth in this. It may be useful to scrutinize more closely in what this striving for equality consists, on which level of human activity it is carried out and what values are involved. It seems that the main problem for Bagrjana - indeed it is a matter of life and death - is love. It is the measure, it is the gauge of woman's liberation. The true liberation of a woman is her equality in love, her right to approve or disapprove of anybody's feelings, her right to live together with whomever she wants to, but also her right to terminate the relationship when she herself feels fatigue and discouragement in a lasting relationship. In confrontation with contemporaneity the poetry of Bagrjana withstands the test of time and is modern above all expectations - it still sounds fresh, it rouses admiration by its apt observations and its novelty. An especially fine feature of this poetry is its unusually subtle description of various stages of emotional links between woman and man: the beginning of love, a woman's devotion, passion, jealousy, cooling of the emotion, the tragic end of love, reminiscences about time spent together - all these tremors of human feelings find in Bagrjana's poetry their own unique expression. They display wisdom and unusual psychological shrewdness, which place her on the roster of the greatest love-poets of modern world literature. In her eagerness for the full emancipation of woman Bagrjana does not hesitate to question the validity of such a time-honoured institution as marriage.

---

[18] L/judmil/ S/tojanov/, "Elisaveta Bagrjana", Hyperion, 1923, vol. II, no. 3, pp. 188-191.

[19] I. Meshekov, Grekhovnata i svjatata pesen na Bagrjana, Sofia, 1928.

[20] After the Second World War two collections of her poetry, Pet zvezdi (1953) and Ot brjag do brjag (1963), appeared.

Earlier Liliev had taken up this theme in Lunni petna:

Тежат ми венчалните думи,
венчалния пръстен тежи,
из пусти помръкнали друми
звучат ми вековни лъжи:
-Бъди му послушна робиня
и жертва безводна бъди,
над твоята земна пустиня
ще блеснат алмазни звезди.

Liliev, however, could not bring himself to revolt utterly against tradition. In the final stanza the lyrical hero succumbs to his fate. The ring is a burden but it is too late to escape the fact. It is different with Bagrjana. The very idea that marriage could become something routine, a habit, a matter of indifference between two people, is unacceptable:

Помисли. - Да ти стана жена?
да изпием кипящото вино
в една сънна и кратка година,
да е всеки ден същ, неизмен
и ний всичко един в друг узнали.
Да вървиш неотменно до мене,
без да трепнеш, докосвайки само,
като джес, непреклонното рамо.
Да се върнеш от работа в къщи
и, по навик, набърже целунал
да задремеш над вестник разтворен...

Poems of this type made an impression because they were new. They made an even greater impression because they were written by a woman. This fact should not be overlooked.

What then is the ideal of love for Bagrjana in Vechnata i svjatata? One senses that in her poetry love is indissolubly linked with a sense of freedom. Although the feeling of love is something precious, it should never lead to the domination of one person over another. Moreover, a woman in love should not be expected to agree submissively to everything. The times when Penelope awaited Odysseus belong to the past:

Не съм аз древноелинска Пенелопа --
смирено да тъка и разтъкавам
и чакам двадесет години Одисея --
зареян по море и суша, запленяван
от нимфите на острови незнайни,--
за да се върне някога при мене, но тогава,
[illegible] би почнало.

Her individuality must be respected even when it is necessary to break with tradition. The poetess speaks of this clearly in another poem from the cycle "Penelopa na XX vek". The poetess wants to throw off all the chains which shackle her true, authentic nature:

Бих искала с един безумен скок в безкрая
да скъсам всички възли - и да видя
сама, освободена - себе си - лика си
без минало, без родословие, без възраст, име.

We have indicated the most important aspects of the love-motif in Bagrjana's poetry, but we are still far from achieving a complete analysis of its diversity. Suffice it to mention the poem "Requiem", which may well be called the pearl of Bulgarian poetry and is worthy of being included in the most highly selective anthology of the world's love-lyrics. The intimate, subtle lyrical quality of this poem mirrors the poetess' own tragic experience - sorrow, despair, dreams of lost happiness.

The interrelationship between love and freedom in Bagrjana's poetry is forcefully stated in Zvezda na morjaka through the motif of space and travel. Numerous cycles devoted to various geographical areas and cities - Brittany, Paris, Venice, Slovenia - betray this fondness for travel. Change of scene becomes the fountainhead of fresh experience, new hopes, the illusion that one can start life from the beginning. Travel, space, speed rejuvenate and revitalize. The conquest of space includes an element of mystery and provides new impressions for the poetic imagination[21] - an example is "Ekspres v pustinjata" from Surtse choveshko.

By comparison with Bagrjana's first two volumes, we observe in the third, Surtse choveshko, a certain smothering of the joyful and primitive enchantment with the world. The groundwork of the whole volume is reflection - on the essence of human life, on human fate and suffering, on joy and death. In other words the poetess wrestles with those concepts which constitute the essential questions of our existence. One senses a certain tiredness in her, but not resignation. Bagrjana is too vital a poet to surrender to such feelings. In the poetic apostrophe "Prolog" which opens the volume Surtse choveshko, the poetess proclaims that she is ready to meet all reverses of fortune, all worries and defeats, but she does not want to lose her inward ardor, that ardor which is the source of life conceived of as love. In conjunction with this poem the short cycle of poems under the title Kolelo becomes better understandable. Asked by a Soviet critic[22] which of her poems she would recognize as the most important as her poetic credo, Bagrjana without hesitation pointed to "Kolelo". The circle is to her the symbol of life. Life is constant motion, a cycle of phases of Nature, and as such is eternal. Man exists in order to maintain the age-long cycle of life. Man exists in order that life should not be suspended. Consequently death does not exist in Bagrjana's poetry as the absolute end, as nothingness.

---

[21] Interesting comments on the motif of space and travel occur in P. Zarev's article "Svetut na Elisaveta Bagrjana," Literaturna misul, 1968, no. 4, pp. 3-41.

[22] B. Brajnina, "Samodiva. Elisaveta Bagrjana", Novyj mir, 1971, no. 7, pp. 245-252.

In the cycle Most, written between 1937 and 1943, we find some new motifs devoted to nature and to great historical events of the time. Other poems treat the old themes in Bagrjana's poetry. Anxiety, fear and uncertainty are Bagrjana's response to events at the end of the 1930's and the early 1940's. Among the best examples of Bagrjana's political poetry are "Klounut govori", "Most", "Vekut i nie".

Bagrjana spoke out on the anxieties of her generation, and took up for the first time in Bulgarian literature so forcefully the universal problems of mankind. Thanks to these values, and in spite of some less brilliant work after 1944, Bagrjana will go down in the history of Bulgarian culture as one of its greatest representatives.

Beside Bagrjana, one of the foremost personalities in Bulgarian poetry of the 1920's and 1930's was Atanas Dalchev (born 1902). The literary production of this poet is not great. Until 1944 he had written no more than sixty or seventy poems. After 1944 he "disappeared" from Bulgarian literature as a spokesman of Subjectivism and Individualism. Only recently has he been "restored" as a great poet. During the last four or five years three more or less complete editions of his poetry have been published.

Dalchev made his debut in 1923 in the Symbolist periodical Hyperion. However, although it sounds paradoxical, almost all Dalchev's critics agree that he made a major contribution to Bulgarian poetry's final break with Symbolism.

Dalchev published four small collections of poetry: Prozorets (1926), Stikhotvorenija (1928), Parizh (1930), and Angelut na Shartur (1943). His can be called the poetry of the concrete, and of human alienation. These two nouns indicate the artistic uniqueness of his poetry and its philosophical importance. Dalchev's poetry is not subject to easy interpretation. In its structure one can easily note certain transformations of both the formal structure of poetic imagery and a shifting emphasis on different aspects of the phenomenon of human alienation. Let us try to illustrate this with some concrete examples.

In his early literary output Dalchev was disposed toward a kind of Creativism in which the point of departure is always one fact or sensation. A typical manifestation of this creative method is the poem "Prozorets". The point of departure is one short sentence, a four-foot trochee: "Eto nasheto zimno stuklo", a frozen window. The next verse makes this fact unreal, as it were: This is no more a window such as we know from our experience. We can see through it "neither roads nor houses". Instead we have on it a "white forest of silver". The following stanzas depict the mosaic drawn by the frost. It is a legendary world. Two small persons are roaming through this "silvery and white forest": they are the poet's brother and sister. They do not fear to go through the dense forest because there are no wolves and winds in it. Thus the whole poem takes on a different meaning from what we expected in the beginning. The window is no longer an aperture through which we see the real world, but an aperture towards an unknown, fictitious world in which a "bird with golden feathers" has made its home.

Let us again exphasize: this unreal world is built from very concrete material, it does not go beyond reality, it does not appeal to the abstract symbols used by the Symbolists. Dalchev has demonstrated the alienation of man by revealing his dreams about the ideal world.

The role of concrete and real objects grows even stronger in Dalchev's poetry at the end of the 1920's and in the 1930's. In the volume Parizh human beings are living among stones; there is not even a single tree in sight. Nature has vanished, as in "44 Avenue du Maine". Man as an individual has disappeared as well; he has been dragged into the cog-wheels of modern, mechanized and commercialized civilization. The dehumanization of life reaches the point where the individual has become a supplement to the powerful commercial machine. In the poem "Nosachi na reklamata" we read:

Човечество, спри да въздишаш,
скрий лицемерните сълзи.
Човек не ни е брат, а зид
на който се лепят афиши.

In the second period of his poetic development Dalchev still utilizes contrast as a stylistic device, but it no longer manifests itself as dream vs. reality. The poet's imagination does not reach out toward a dream-world. The contrast is composed only of realities which surround us and serve to enhance the dimensions of the world's dehumanization. The pessimism of the lyrical hero reaches a point where there is no space even for dreams. In the poem "Snjag" the white snow becomes immediately dirty when it falls on the city. People trample it with their dirty shoes. The snow remains white only on a children's playground.

The poems Dalchev wrote at the end of the 1930's have been gathered in the volume entitled Angelut na Shartur. Here the poet's pessimism reaches its climax, and his poetic metier reflects even more subtlety in exposing emotional tensions, without, however, losing anything of its "object"-ivity. The peculiarity of this period consists in the poet's struggle towards objectivization of of our spiritual experiences through outer reality. An individual becomes aware of his situation, as a rule a tragic one, through objects and phenomena which are transformed into allegory. This method achieves its most dramatic effects in the poem "Sreshta". Five crippled men return in thier wheel-chairs from a promenade. In surroundings where everything is growing, regenerating, they suddenly realize that the stumps of their limbs will never grow again. But the poet does not cease to be cruel: the crippled men meet women with baby-carriages. This contrast makes them even more sensitive about their tragedy, and life seems to be a savage, unjustified insult.

It is time for a short recapitulation. As we have said, Dalchev is a poet of the concrete. His poetry is a poetry of objects. The poet deliberately eliminates from his poems symbols, metaphors, comparisons as means of stylistic expression as he strives towards simplification of the poetic message. But the objects serve only as a pretext. Behind their outer appearances sadness, loneliness, and tragedy are usually concealed. All these feelings, however, are expressed with great economy of words, muted, as it were. From the examples given one can draw the conclusion that the author's obsession is the alienation of man, his confusion in the contemporary world. This theme was also taken up, as we have seen, by Raztsvetnikov. His interest in it, however, had an emotional justification a son of the village could not give his consent to the overwhelming domination of machines. With Dalchev the interest in and the protest against human alienation have a clearly intellectual basis. In this lies his uniqueness, his peculiarity, his greatness as a poet.

Let us now go over to the fourth and last group of poets - the Revolutionary poets - who occupy a position of importance in official Bulgarian critiques and histories of literature. The author who is credited with giving birth to revolutionary poetry in Bulgaria is Dimitur Poljanov (1876-1953). However, his merit as a proletarian poet has been considerably dimmed by offical exaggeration of Khristo Smirnenski's (1898-1923) role in literature. Judging by the pattern of well-known articles and dissertations by party-minded critics, Poljanov was the first proletarian poet but Smirnenski by the greatness of his talent elevated this poetry to a higher stage, that of Socialist Realism. As the first poet of Socialist Realism in Bulgarian literature Smirnenski is considered by many official critics to be the greatest poet in the period between the two World Wars.

Without a doubt the author of Da bude den (1923) belonged to the more talented poets of his generation, but his present position in Bulgarian literature must be considered a result of the political circumstances prevailing after 1944. Smirnenski went through an evolution - quite a typical one for many poets, not only Bulgarian, of his generation: he started as a Symbolist. Then for a short time he expresses a general dissatisfaction with the existing social structure, and finally becomes a poet of socialist revolution.

However, Smirnenski never freed himself from the stylistic ballast of Symbolism and it is this that now makes his poetry appear shallow and obsolete. Smirnenski infused the old symbols, often borrowed both from the ancient and the Christian mythology, with a new revolutionary content. Prometheus symbolizes a worker, the cross the idea of revolution, Cain the killer of partisans, the Messiah himself a revolutionary. Christ represents the oppressed, Golgotha the embodiment of enlightened thought, Zeus the symbol of gold and capital. Historical figures like Spartacus, Nero, and Socrates take on a clearly allegorical meaning. The themes of Smirnenski's poetry are confined to a closed circle of social problems: descriptions of extreme poverty, dehumanizing working conditions, humiliation within the existing social system, the awakening of class-consciousness in the worker, and the proletarian revolutionary struggle - all these motifs are characteristic of Smirnenski's poetry. "Vurvja kraj smulchanite khizhi", "Ulichna zhena" "Vuglekopach", "Zhultata gostenka", and "Johann" should be recognized as the most thought-provoking of his poems.

Smirnenski found no followers in the 1920's. It was not until the 1930's that a few poets - Khristo Radevski (born 1903), Mladen Isaev (born 1907), Nikola Lankov (1902-1965), and Nikola Jonkov Vaptsarov refer to the slight existing tradition of revolutionary poetry. The most rigid and one-sided in his ideological attitude is Radevski (i.e. "Kum partijata"). As far as Isaev is concerned, he attempts to combine fidelity to socialist ideology with some personal elements, as in "Pismo do majka mi". There can be little doubt, however, that the most talented of this group was Nikola Jonkov Vaptsarov (1909-1942). One may disagree with his political and ideological attitude, one may question the artistic maturity of some of his poems, but certainly one can hardly deny him the stature of a great poet. Vaptsarov's poetic world is not complicated: all passions and feelings of modern man are determined by the basic conflict between capital and labor. The lyric hero of almost all Vaptsarov's poems is entirely absorbed by this conflict and accepts all the consequences of his commitment. Love, fatherland, family feeling, human relationships - all are viewed through the prism of social conflict. Vaptsarov also grasped the fact that for the rendering of the dramatic character of our epoch the traditional systems of versification would not suffice. Admittedly, his predecessors also introduced some innovations, but without any greater success. With Vaptsarov the new poetic form became a natural exponent of content. Having become, in a sense, the people's tribune, Vaptsarov substituted intonational phrase for traditional regular verse. Most often he avoids the regular stanza. He reduces the role of meter, introduces monologue and dialogue. He makes use of the letter to convey the poetical message. All these new devices in the sphere of composition and versification have far-reaching consequences in the linguistic quality, in the style of poetic language. In Vaptsarov's poems everyday speech has been skillfully utilized to equal other means of artistic expression in poetry.

It is perhaps worthwhile to consider yet another question: Why did the poetry of Vaptsarov, although it frequently treats everyday problems, not sink, not dissolve into flat realism? The answer could only be: the author of "Letter" (we have in mind the poem which starts with the words "Ti pomnish li...") believed unshakeably in the greatness and integrity of the idea, he believed in the unity of word and action. He testified to this belief with his own life. When in the poem "Shte stroim zavod" Vaptsarov writes:

Ще строим завод,
огромен завод,
със яки
бетонни стени;
мъже и жени,
народ,
ще строим завод за живота.

he is convinced that such a "factory" really can be built. If we look at Vaptsarov's poetry from this perspective we suddenly realize that we have before us a poet - an idealist, a poet who worships certain ideals, who wants to transform this world into Utopia.

Vaptsarov published only one collection of poems: Motorni pesni (1940). However, these twenty-one poems of varying lengths mark an important stage in the development of Bulgarian Revolutionary poetry and are not without significance for the whole of Bulgarian literature.

This general picture of Bulgarian poetry between 1918 and 1944 would be incomplete if we did not mention those poets of note who started to publish just before the war broke out. We have in mind Veselin Khanchev (1919-1967), Valeri Petrov (1920), Aleksandur Gerov (1919), Radoj Ralin (1923), Aleksandur Vutimski (1919-1943), Bozhidar Bozhilov (1923), and Bogomil Rajnov (1919). All of them evince one or another kind of affinity with Western literature in their quest for new artistic values. It seems, however, that the strongest influence upon their early writings was A. Dalchev.[23] Because of the fact that they did not publish much before 1944 (an exception is Aleksandur Vutimski),their literary output should be discussed within the framework of post-war literature.

It may seem that we have referred here to all the names of importance in Bulgarian poetry between 1918 and 1944. No doubt in a more comprehensive study those poets who do not fit into one of the four groups we identified at the outset would also deserve mention - M. Grubeshlieva (1900), J. Stubel (1897-1952), Ivan Mirchev (1897), and Nikola Rakitin (1885-1934), for example. Rakitin in particular deserves the attention of anyone concentrating on Bulgarian poetry of the twentieth century. Rakitin, a poet of landscapes, dreams and noble outbursts, stood between Symbolism and the new trends in Bulgarian poetry. He succeeded, however, in his efforts to work out his own artistic profile, and this together with his deep humanism has earned him an enduring place in the history of Bulgarian literature.

---

[23] I. Popivanov, "Veselin Khanchev", Literaturna misul, 1968, no. 6, pp. 81-98.

In summary, it seems that the main aesthetic quality of Bulgarian poetry between the two World Wars was its sharp reaction against Symbolism and its break with the naive patriotism and social motifs of the nineteenth century. The poetry of the 1920's and 1930's suddenly became richer, new themes of universal character began to dominate the work of many poets, and new devices were employed to refresh artistic form.

Which literary current in Europe did this poetry follow? If anybody should try to give an unequivocal answer to this question he would be in error. It seems impossible to find such an answer. The Symbolists remained under the influence of the reciprocal trend between Russia and France. Milev sought inspiration among the German Expressionists. Bagrjana has often been compared with Anna Akhmatova. It is said that Furnadzhiev was under the influence of Russian Imaginism. In all these allegations there is a seed of truth but it is doubtful whether one can really speak of Expressionism, Acmeism and even less of Imaginism in Bulgarian literature. Inadequate, too, it well may seem to draw an analogy between Dalchev and the poetry of Hermetism.[24] Whereas the poets of Hermetism tried purposely to obscure the meaning of their poems, we find in Dalchev a rather clear presentation of his obsessions and interests.

One can say without much risk of error that we find very little of the extreme experimentation in Bulgarian poetry known from other Slavic literatures. The most interesting artistic effects were achieved by those poets who refused to follow foreign patterns blindly and turned towards national, and primarily folklore, sources. These poets it was who made the most valuable and lasting contribution to Bulgarian poetry. They may be justly considered the pride of Bulgarian literature.

---

[24] A. Lozovski, "Atanas Dalchev novator v poeticheskoto izobrazhenie", Literaturna misul, 1965, no. 5, pp. 36-50.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Paper by Professor Mozejko

PINTO: Thank you for this most interesting paper, which I enjoyed very much. I have a few questions and thoughts. What further work do you think should be done on this period? Would it be possible to do a comparative book on this period?

MOSER: One of the chief tasks before us was to analyze the state of poetry between the wars, which Prof. Mozejko has just done in this paper. But could Prof. Mozejko make some comments on prose during this period? He has, after all published some work in this area.

LORD: I enjoyed the paper very much. However, what do you mean by the word "folklore?" Do you connect it with naroden, which is a tricky word? And how are you employing the word "sociological" -- does this mean something linked to the study of socialism, or the study of society? I do not think that naroden poets are the same as traditional poets. True, they revert to tradition as a reaction against symbolism with its foreign roots, but I am not sure that Furnadzhiev's referring to the "earth" means he is using folklore. Just because an author writes of the village does not mean that he employs folklore; Elin Pelin is not a folklore writer, nor is Yovkov. Some of them use mythological images more than folklore ones. I am uncertain about the word naroden: what word should we use?

PUNDEFF: I might suggest roden.

BYNUM: Perhaps we should say 'popular,' or just comment that these are traditional writers but not folklore writers.

MOSER: I object to the word traditional here because Bagryana is very international in her outlook. Rakitin writes of the village, but he does not use folklore. Bagryana and Dalchev are very different from each other too.

LORD: This may not have been folklore, but it was an exciting development.

MOZEJKO: The national spirit is often expressed in folklore. A comparative study of Akhmatova and Bagryana would probably be very fruitful, and this would also be a way to place Bulgarian literature in an international perspective. One of you mentioned Dimitur Shishmanov, of whom I have read a little, but I cannot say much about him. I spoke of certain poets as traditional poets because they did much to revive Bulgarian poetry by using national traditions, including folklore. At any rate, they relied much more on folklore than on foreign patterns. Are the words 'folkloristic' and naroden one and the same?

LORD: We need a precise study delineating the difference between folklore and the notion of the native spirit. Why do you think there are any folklore elements in Bagryana?

BYNUM: Perhaps when you use the word 'folkloristic' you have in mind the culture of the village, but these are not the same thing. How may Furnadzhiev and Raztsvetnikov be considered revolutionaries? A great deal of their poetry was highly personal.

MOZEJKO: A poet like Furnadzhiev treats social topics, but from his own very personal point of view. That is what makes him a poet.

LORD: Isn't that what makes Vaptsarov a poet as well?

MOZEJKO: Vaptsarov was deeply committed to a political viewpoint. The moment a poet adopts a political program he ceases to be a poet. Socialist realism has survived because it has been promoted by the government.

PINTO: Writers from before the war used folklore in their search for something new. As for Bagryana, she sometimes verges on folklore and often uses the term roden.

MOZEJKO: Narodnost is a difficult concept to deal with. If we go back in Russian criticism we can see that the word has been interpreted in very different ways over the course of time. What precisely does the word mean? I am happy to have the comments voiced here, for they will make me think further about certain aspects of my paper. When I speak of the influence of the native spirit on writers it is difficult for me to avoid the word "folklore". A discussion of folklore would be a different matter.

ARONSON: The selo is meaningful to Bulgarians; for them folklore is very much alive.

LORD: Folklore is connected with romanticism. There is a gap between folklore and the reality it describes.

BYNUM: Folklore is a part of the tradition. It has ethnographic value.

ARONSON: Dancing the khoro is not exactly folklore.

PINTO: Folklore has a romantic connotation.

PUNDEFF: In Bulgarian folklore is narodni umotvoreniya, but what we are discussing is bit.

BYNUM: Both of these terms are ethnographic in their content.

BULGARIAN LITERATURE 1944-1970

by

Charles A. Moser
The George Washington University

On September 9, 1944, modern Bulgarian history entered a new phase. Whereas before Bulgarian literature had developed under conditions of relative freedom, on that day a thoroughly statist system of cultural controls began to be imposed gradually upon it. As formulated in the doctrine of "Socialist Realism" in the arts, this approach held that the writer should not only refrain from criticizing the shortcomings and defects of the new order, as he had been accustomed to doing for previous orders for so many centuries, but that he must even place his pen positively at the service of the political regime. He would not be permitted the luxury of silence if he disagreed with official policy: all must join in active support for what the state was currently doing. This situation existed in fact during the worst years of Stalinism in Bulgarian literature, and it continues to be upheld as the ideal by many even now. For the last 10 or 15 years, however, the shackles upon literature have been noticeably loosened and Bulgarian letters have been allowed a significant degree of freedom in treating the eternal problems of human existence, which, far from vanishing, have become much more acute in communist society. No contemporary Bulgarian writers have yet spoken the truth about their own society with the candor of a Pasternak or a Solzhenitsyn, none has publicly risked prison and the concentration camp as Andrey Sinyavsky and Andrey Amalrik have done in the Soviet Union, but within more modest limits Bulgarian writers have tried to circumvent the restrictions imposed by communist dogma upon their art. Many of their efforts deserve the attention of scholars in the West who are at liberty to examine the entire record of Bulgarian literature over the past quarter-century without ideological blinders.

The initial segment of the communist period in Bulgarian culture may be divided into several sub-periods. Thanks in part to western political pressures, the Soviet Union delayed in enforcing absolute control upon its Bulgarian satellite: thus Georgi Dimitrov did not return from exile in the Soviet Union for more than a year after the ninth of September, and Bulgaria was not declared a people's republic until 1946. Thus it is not astonishing that these first years encompassed a transitional period in Bulgarian culture as well as in politics. Even though Bulgaria had not been so directly affected by the war as several other Eastern European countries, especially Poland, war experiences were used as material for many stories and novels produced in 1945, 1946, and to a considerable extent in later years as well. It was in 1945 that Stoyan Daskalov published the first volume of his three-part novel Put, whose hero welcomes the "popular revolution" of 1944 after having passed through grievous experiences in the war. Many writers understood very early what was required of them politically: Dimitur Dimov, who later underwent much unpleasantness over his novel Tyutyun, in 1945 published Osudeni dushi, a novel depicting a western bourgeois society on the downward path. Some works on America appeared: they no doubt were written for the purpose of exposing the horrors of the capitalist system, from which the Bulgarians had then mercifully been liberated.

The year 1944 was likewise a watershed for literary and intellectual periodicals: those which had existed before ceased to appear, and new periodicals expressive of the dawning era came into being. The newspaper Literaturen front began publication very early, in 1944; 1946 saw the beginnings of the scholarly journal on problems of language and literature Ezik i literatura, which still exists today. In 1945 and 1946 it was still possible to organize a few groups and found a few publications not completely under the control of the state. For example, 1945 saw the birth of the periodical Literaturen podem, initially the organ of "southern Bulgarian literary circles," and later the organ of literary circles in Bulgaria generally. It survived only until May of 1948. In early 1946 there was begun a group about which I know little, the "Obshtestvo na svobodnite pisateli." From its name one would surmise that the society had established itself in opposition to the official literary organizations, and from the fact that it was disbanded in 1950 one would gather that it may not have been appreciated by the authorities. Konstantin Petkanov, a prolific writer of the 1930's who attempted to aid his colleagues in difficulty with the government after 1944, founded Balkanski pregled in 1946, but again it lasted only until December of 1949. Unofficial or semi-official journals and organizations had no chance of surviving very many years.

In the meantime, however, the state was busily forming its own groupings. It took over the Union of Bulgarian Writers, an organization which, though begun in 1913, had never played anything like the leading role which it was to assume after 1944. Evidently one of the early steps in the process of elevating the Union to its present all-powerful position was the calling of the first national conference of writers in Bulgaria in September of 1945. Then, after a period of uncertainty in 1947-48, rather unfruitful years for Bulgarian literature, in 1949 the state moved to place firm clamps upon the national culture.

The year 1949 witnessed the deaths of two men, each of whom was important for modern Bulgarian culture in his own way. The first was Georgi Dimitrov, the head of the Bulgarian communist state. After his demise he was deified in literature and art, in the best Stalinist tradition, in the same tradition he was interred in a mausoleum in the center of Sofia modelled upon the Lenin mausoleum in Moscow. The second death was that of Elin Pelin, the major 'bourgeois' author to have survived 1944. He had written little fiction for some two decades before 1944, and he had generally made his peace with the new regime, but Elin Pelin did display sufficient integrity, before he left the scene, to protest against the gray conformity imposed upon literature by the pressure to write only about tractors and factories. He was fortunate enough not to have the witness the worst of literary Stalinism, when his ideal of humanism in literature would for a time be totally discarded.

By 1950 the transition to socialist realism in Bulgarian literature had been largely accomplished. The fallen leader Georgi Dimitrov became a favorite subject of literature: Kamen Kalchev contributed Sin na rabotnicheska klasa, a fictionalized biography of him, in 1949; in 1950 Bozhidar Bozhilov came out with the narrative poem Dimitrov; in 1952 Khristo Radevski, Nikola Furnadzhiev and Radoy Ralin edited a verse anthology entitled Dimitrov ni vodi. The literature of industrialization and collectivization became fashionable: see Ivan Burin's collection of verse with the title Proletta i traktorista (1950). Other instances of this genre were such works as Andrey Gulyashki's MT stantsiya (1950), Ivan Radoev's Izrastvat novi khora (1952), and Stoyan Daskalov's account of collectivization, Melnitsata Lipovanski of 1951. The West came in for a large share of abuse at this period in such writings as G'oncho Belev's Kakvo vidyakh v Amerika, which appeared a little earlier, in 1948; Pavel Spasov's Gospodata ot Zapad (1950); and the satirist Svetoslav Minkov's Kolet ot Amerika of 1950 and Imperiya na glada of 1952 (it should be noted here that Minkov had taken the bourgeois west as a major target for his attacks even during the 1930's, so that he had to adapt himself very little to fit the spirit of the 1950's); and Valeri Petrov's verse collection Tam na Zapad(1954). Travellers in deed or in imagination to the Soviet Union, on the other hand, were expected to return with rather different impressions for their readers. The poetess Elisaveta Bagryana contributed to this current with the verse collection Pet zvezdi (1953), containing many poems which did not harmonize with her creative personality; and in 1954 Pavel Matev published his travel impressions of the Soviet Union entitled V suvetskata strana.

It was difficult to resist the overwhelming pressure for conformity which pervaded Bulgarian society during the Stalinist years. Very few writers had even the courage to fall silent at this time. One of those who did was the poet Atanas Dalchev, and the younger generation of poets in Bulgaria now esteems him greatly for his having resisted to this extent. Almost the only way to publish anything relatively free of political control at that time was to withdraw into the distant historical past. Some of the best contemporary Bulgarian writers of the older generation followed this tack. Stoyan Zagorchinov went as far back as medieval Bulgaria in his work of 1950, Praznik v Boyana, which treats of the famous Boyana frescoes; Dimitur Talev began his tale in the early nineteenth century, describing the struggle for Bulgarian cultural and intellectual independence, in the trilogy Zhelezniyat svetilnik (1952), Ilinden (1953), and Prespanskite kambani (1954). It was generally advisable not to write historical novels dealing with events more or less within living memory, although the old-line communist writer Georgi Karaslavov could manage this in his book Obiknoveni khora (part one appeared in 1952, part two in 1956, and part three in 1963) because he approached the relatively recent events of the early 1920's and preceding years ideologically correctly. Dimitur Dimov, however, encountered serious difficulties when he published a novel describing all the complexities of human life. The book in question, Tyutyun, which first appeared in 1951, described the conflict between two brothers, one of whom was a tobacco tycoon and the other a communist partisan leader during the war. Although the novel was good enough to receive a Dimitrov prize in the year of its publication, in 1952 it came under heavy attack from critics and "readers" on guard for ideological purity. Although Dimov had some defenders, he ended by bringing Tyutyun out in a second edition in 1953, by which time he had reworked it into a perfectly acceptable socialist realist novel, with whiter heroes and blacker villains, so that even the dullest reader could tell the difference between them. Authors who may have had decent novels hidden away in their desks at the time would not have been encouraged to submit them for publication when they saw what had happened to Dimov's book. Instead, they waited until the situation eased, as in fact it did within a few years.

After Stalin's death in 1953, the literary controls in the Soviet Union began to be relaxed. The Bulgarians were tardy in following the Soviet lead toward liberalization, for the rumblings among Bulgarian intellectuals were not highly audible before 1955. During that year articles appeared in the Bulgarian press expressing dissatisfaction with the current state of intellectual life in the country. As early as April of 1955 the novelist and short story writer Pavel Vezhinov had published an article in Literaturen front complaining of the standardization of Bulgarian literature. Other pieces of similar tenor came out in Literaturen front over the remainder of that year, and in January of 1956 a Yugoslav journalist printed in Politika an article containing negative comments on their native culture by various Bulgarian intellectuals. The controversy continued through 1956 under the leadership of such writers as Ivan Rudnikov, Ivan Martinov and Ivan Burin, despite the attempts of government leaders to place limitations upon it, until the Hungarian uprising of October 1956 gave the defenders of orthodoxy an excellent club to use upon the dissidents in 1957. During the headiest part of the Bulgarian thaw the newly liberated writers thought they would be able to write about almost any of the tragedies of their lives. At that time there appeared works like Ivan Martinov's collection of short stories, Razkazi za Anton Belin, in which he attempted to offer a truthful picture of the "new" Bulgarian man; Emil Manov's novelette Nedostoveren sluchay of 1957; and Todor Genov's play Strakh (1957), depicting a communist official corrupted by the lust for power. A rebellion within the Union of Bulgarian Writers, which had long been the chief instrument for the official control of literature, led to the resignation of the old-line communist poet Khristo Redevski as secretary, but his replacement by Georgi Karaslavov was scarcely an improvement.

As had been the case during an unsettled period of a decade before, new periodicals came into being during 1957. One such was a scholarly journal which continues to appear, Literaturna misul, the other was a more purely literary publication, Plamuk. A revival of the journal of the same name published in the 1920's by that quintessential rebel Geo Milev, Plamuk served as a rallying point for the dissidents of 1957. After Khrushchev's speech of August 1957 reasserting the Soviet state's control of literature, however, the Bulgarian authorities purged the editorial board of Plamuk in time for the issue of December 1957. Still, the magazine printed no total recantations of its former position, and the writers who had been prominent in the liberalization process were not forced to adopt demeaning stances before being permitted to publish once again. This constituted a step forward which has not yet been undone, and which has established the tone for the subsequent history of Bulgarian letters.

History loves to play tricks upon its children. A tragic one perpetrated during the "thaw" era involved the poet Pen'o Penev, who began publishing his first individual poems in periodicals in 1955, at the age of about 25. Penev was a young man of enthusiastic belief in the communist society which he thought was being introduced in his native land; heavily influenced by Vladimir Mayakovsky, he dedicated his pen to exhorting men to be worthy of the ideals by which he was inspired, to labor unselfishly for the good of generations yet to come. He published his only collection of verse, Dobro utro, khora, in 1956, at the height of the thaw. Curiously enough, his ultra-communist verse fit the temper of the times, for he was a pure idealist. In the end, however, the pressure of reality proved too much, when he realized that most of his contemporaries were unmoved by the selfless idealism which permeated him. Thus he took his own life in 1959, shortly before his thirtieth birthday. His poems, which could have emerged as lifeless propaganda for the "bright future", are imbued with a power of belief which can influence even a reader ultimately unconvinced of the correctness of the poet's view.

The feverish period of the liberalization of Bulgarian culture from 1955 through 1957 was succeeded by a more uncertain time, which, however, preserved many of the gains made during the thaw. The poet Georgi Dzhagarov, today secretary of the Union of Bulgarian Writers, began to emerge into some prominence. Several authors of the older generation came forward with new contributions. The poet Nikola Furnadzhiev, who had constantly to atone for having publicly left the communist party in 1925, when he no doubt never dreamed it would come to power, published a collection of verse Po putishtata ti vurvyakh (1958), which contained a substantial dose of ideology for all its poetic title; Dimitur Talev delved far back into history with his three-part novel of medieval Bulgaria, Samuil (first two parts published in 1958; third part published in 1960); Emiliyan Stanev ventured closer to contemporary times with a novel set in the years immediately following the First World War, Ivan Kondarev (first part published 1958; second part 1962; parts three and four 1964).

The younger writer Bogomil Raynov utilized western culture in his own peculiar way with such stories as those to be found in his collection of 1958 Chovekut na ugula: Raynov takes as his themes the personal and social tragedies endemic in the society of western Europe, primarily France. He does not avoid the hard questions entirely: for example, in the title story of the collection he describes a French communist who must wrestle with the problem of explaining the Hungarian uprising. On the whole, though, Raynov leaves the distinct impression that the bourgeois system of the West is doomed eventually to be replaced by a new communist order. He transmits this message with subtlety, however, and his readers gain some understanding of life's tragedies even when they are placed in a western setting.

As a generalization it may be said that in the years from 1958 until now there have been few external 'events' in Bulgarian literature which may serve as landmarks for the literary historian, by contrast to the turbulent period from 1944 to 1958, when Bulgarian cultural life underwent so many wrenching changes. The last twelve years or so may be treated as something of an unbroken whole, and thus a distinct contrast to the roughly fifteen years from 1944 to 1958, which saw the consolidation of cultural power in the hands of the state, the ruthless imposition of the doctrine of Socialist Realism upon Bulgarian literature, followed by an outburst of repressed anger and a partial reimposition of controls. By comparison with that history, the last twelve years have been very quiet in Bulgaria.

Perhaps the most significant thing to be said about Bulgarian literature from 1958 until the present is that it has partially freed itself from the burden of contemporaneity, which means -- however the fact may be disguised -- that it is possible for it to evade the demand of Socialist Realist doctrine that it concern itself principally with social problems of the present and immediate future. Literature of the official type has by no means vanished from the lists of Bulgarian publishing houses: such books as Ivan Mirchev's Zvezdi nad Neva, a verse collection of 1961, Stoyan Daskalov's stories about Georgi Dimitrov, Osemte khlyaba (1962), Khristo Radevski's Nebeto e blizo and Nikolay Zidarov's narrative poem Geroichna Kuba (both 1963), are merely a few of the many titles treating approved subjects in the approved way. But the fact that such works as these continue to appear with the active encouragement of the state publishing houses is in the long run less important than the fact that now many works can be printed which do not deal at all with the contemporary social situation, within the country or abroad. The pressure for conformity remains strong, but it is no longer irresistible. Moreover, the imagination of the younger generation of Bulgarian readers and writers has been captured primarily by works which skirt the established themes in order to come to grips with deeper and less transient problems of human existence.

The writer may arrange the appropriate 'distance' between himself and the contemporary scene in several ways. As we have seen, even a more or less orthodox writer like Bogomil Raynov can deal with deeper questions by the device of siting his stories in western Europe. A more common method, however, continues to be the writing of novels, stories and plays set in Bulgaria, but at a considerable remove in time. Kamen Zidarov's Bezsmurtna pesen of 1959 -- later, in 1962, transformed into a powerful verse play, Ivan Shishman, which has been very popular on the Sofia stage -- describes the last days of the Second Bulgarian Empire before its fall to the Turks in 1393, a period in medieval Bulgarian history which has never ceased to captivate the imaginations of modern Bulgarian writers. Other members of the older generation also delved into problems of ancient Bulgarian history, for example Stoyan Zagorchinov in his Ivaylo (1962), treating the famous peasant revolutionary of the 1270's, or Dimitur Talev, who added to his lengthy series of historical novels a study of Paisii Khilendarski, Khilendarskiyat monakh, also published in 1962. This rich tradition of historical novel-writing in Bulgaria gave rise to what is surely the finest Bulgarian novel of the 1960's, and one of the very best in the history of the Bulgarian novel generally, Anton Donchev's Vreme razdelno. Donchev, born in 1930, is much younger than Talev or Zagorchinov, but he is obviously a writer of singular talent. Also published in an excellent English translation as Time of Parting, Donchev's novel chronicles the forced Islamization of the Bulgarian population of the Elindenya valley in the Rhodope mountains, giving graphic descriptions of the physical cruelties and moral dilemmas which accompanied the entire process. In Vreme razdelno Donchev sets the most serious questions of human endeavor and commitment in a context entirely separated from that of the present day. He also experiments with recounting the story from two points of view: that of a 'converted' Frenchman accompanying the Turks on their bloodthirsty mission, and that of a Bulgarian priest who bears the brunt of the Turkish assault. All this is combined with a poetic feel for language and nature description which makes the book altogether exemplary. Before publishing Vreme razdelno Donchev had written a Skazanie za vremeto na Samuila (1961), accorded little notice; since then he has edited a collection of science-fiction stories, Chovekut, koyto tursi. The link between Donchev's interest in historical writing on the one hand and science-fiction on the other may be worthy of investigation. Another representative of the older generation of writers, Emiliyan Stanev, though a party member, has yielded to the pressure toward historical writing of late with his novel Legenda za Sibin of 1968, a short work treating one of the oldest periods of Bulgarian history and printed in a format partially resembling an old manuscript. Though not previously known particularly for his historical interests, Stanev is following up Legenda za Sibin with research into the mystical movement of Hesychasm, the philosophical school of Eastern Orthodoxy prevalent in the 14th century, before Bulgaria's fall to the Turks.

This intensified interest in historical novel writing may be linked with the remarkable popularity of the border-line genre of memoirs, the production of which within the past decade has been astonishing. Perhaps the best and most interesting from a literary point of view are those by Konstantin Konstantinov, Put prez godinite. The first volume, published in 1958, sketches a fascinating portrait of the Bulgarian literary milieu during the first decade of the twentieth century, and gives the reader valuable insights into the psychologies of some of Bulgaria's most famous writers, as perceived by one of her most accurate and dispassionate reporters.

Bulgaria's writers, especially her younger ones, are capable not merely of creating geographical or temporal space between themselves and contemporary reality, they also may insert a good deal of psychic space between themselves and that reality. By this I mean simply that they prefer dealing with personal problems, in isolation from the questions which agitate the larger society. The most striking example of such an approach in a writer who ordinarily is quite conscious of her political obligations is Blaga Dimitrova's Putuvane kum sebe si of 1965: she travels inside her own psyche. A large portion of the younger poets in today's Bulgaria have taken the private concerns of a man like Atanas Dalchev for their own: in each of their short collections of poetry they may include a few poems on political topics, but they are chiefly interested in their personal moral and even religious experience as seen from their own private angle of vision. These poets are fairly numerous; they include Alesandur Gerov, Lyubomir Levchev, Krustyo Stanishev, Damyan Damyanov, and others. Their approach worries some of their elders, who are concerned at their retreat from the life about them, but the current of which they are a part is a powerful one, and they are not to be deflected by mere criticism at this point. Stronger medicine would have to be used, and so far the regime has proved reluctant to reimpose stringent controls upon such writers as these young poets, so long as they pose no direct challenge to its authority.

The key word here, however, is "direct", since several works have appeared during the past decade which contain fairly sharp indirect criticisms of the current state of affairs in Bulgaria. Even the orthodox poet Georgi Dzhagarov contributed to this literature of mild exposure in 1965 with his play Prokurorut, which spoke of the crimes of the "cult of personality" but of course ended in a properly inspirational manner. The play was translated into English and presented on the London stage at one time. More deep-running criticism is offered by Nikolay Khaytov, one of the more promising authors of the middle generation on the Bulgarian literary scene, and one who prefers to remain apolitical. However, his one-act play Puteki can only be interpreted as a major criticism of a bureaucratic system exercising total control over the lives of Bulgarian citizens, manned by officials who are concerned only about their positions and their official instructions, with no understanding of the finer impulses of the human soul. When a person who enjoys making paths to out-of-the-way places in the mountains in order to give others pleasure falls into his hands, the bureaucrat is totally incapable of comprehending his motivations and forbids him to pursue his avocation any further. The tragedy of the play lies not so much in the fact that the bureaucrat is a philistine, as in the circumstance that he both possesses and exercises the power to prevent a sensitive individual from doing good for others. Radoy Ralin, who has been publishing satirical works for some time, treads the edge of the permissible in many of his brief but biting poems and epigrams (see, for instance, his Bezopasni igli of 1960), as well as his short sketches on the deficiencies of Bulgarian life. It is probably true that the foreign reader may gain a more accurate impression of the everyday state of affairs in contemporary Bulgaria from reading Ralin's sketches than he can from any other single source. The regime barely tolerates his shafts, and though he sometimes slips, he never miscalculates very badly. Ralin, however, represents a mild extreme in contemporary literature in his attempts to criticize reality directly. Most of his colleagues prefer to avoid primary confrontation with it. In this way they at least manage to uphold some literary standards, refusing to transform literature into a political instrument.

******

Bulgaria has a number of literary critics and historians of contemporary literature, if there be such a thing as an historian of contemporary literature. From the regime's viewpoint, their most important task is to elaborate further the doctrine of Socialist Realism as it applies to Bulgarian conditions, and to see that individual Bulgarian writers adhere to its tenets so far as possible. Some of the ideologically more orthodox critics have been happy to assume this burden. Georgi Dimitrov-Goshkin, for example, in his Vuprosi i knigi na sotsialisticheskiya realizum (1960), devotes an entire section to a consideration of questions of Marxist esthetics; in a more recent book, Priemlivo i nepriemlivo (1966), he argues that to be a communist is to be innovative, and takes up "questions of our struggle against bourgeois ideology": evidently in his opinion the situation in the mid-1960's is ideologically a trifle disturbing. Other critics have also devoted many pages to ruminations on Socialist Realism: one is Vasil Kolevski in his article "Sotsialisticheskiyat realizum -- veliko zavoevanie na nashiya vek," from his collection Patosut na zhivota - patos na literaturata (1961). The prolific Lyuben Georgiev has contributed a study of the genesis of Socialist Realism, found in his Polemiki po suvremenni literaturni vuprosi of 1965, and Panteley Zarev has written at length on the subject of Socialist Realism as the "great art of our time" in his book Bogatstvoto na literaturniya protses i sotsialisticheskiyat realizum (1960). Surely the subject of Socialist Realism as applied to contemporary literature is one which we may trust Bulgarian scholars to treat exhaustively. The same may be said for the analysis of contemporary Bulgarian life as related to contemporary literature, a topic which modern Bulgarian scholars can scarcely ignore. Efrem Karanfilov has contributed "Suvremennost v intimnata lirika" in his collection of 1965, Literaturno-kriticheski statii: izbrano; the very title of Maksim Naimovich's collection of critical articles, Po putishtata na suvremennostta: literaturno-kriticheski statii(1966) demonstrates his concern for modernity in literature. Occasionally one runs across articles on more general topics, for example lyric poetry in a particular year (Boris Delchev likes to indulge in this sort of thing: see some of the pieces in his Mukite na realista of 1954). On the whole, however, Bulgarian critics tend to produce short pieces on individual authors, or reviews of particular works, a quite natural phenomenon. As a rule they are obliged to measure the writer they are discussing against the generally accepted and well-delineated yardstick provided by the doctrine of Socialist Realism. Consequently they cannot give him much advice on how he should progress in his own way: they are obliged to tell him how he should develop in the way approved by society. There seemingly is no particular pattern for the selection of authors chosen for such articles, except perhaps that satirists like Ralin are avoided. Otherwise, the older and better established writers will be the subjects of more frequent articles, the younger and lesser-known ones will attract less attention. An exception to this is Pen'o Penev, whose suicide in 1959 presented the Bulgarian communist intelligentsia with something of a dilemma. So far a novel by Mitko Ivanov, Povest za Pen'o Penev (1964), has been written about him, as well as an exceedingly detailed biographical study by Lyuben Georgiev, Pen'o Penev -- poetut s vatenkata (1965). Otherwise, most of the books published about contemporary writers appear in the series of brief studies subtitled "literaturno-kriticheski ocherk" and published by the "Bulgarski pisatel" publishing house. Books in this series include Efrem Karanfilov on Andrey Gulyashki (1958), Boyan Nichev on Dimitur Talev (1961), Georgi Tsanev on Nikola Furnadzhiev ([illegible]) (1963), and Atanas Lazovski on Atanas Dalchev (1966). There are no separate studies of some writers who might merit them as much as the preceding, for instance Nikolay Khaytov, Radoy Ralin, Valeri Petrov, Khristo Radevski, Pavel Vezhinov and Emiliyan Stanev. Obviously the standardized literary criteria used by the authors diminish the value of those studies which have appeared in the "Bulgarski pisatel" series.

******

The number of western scholars professing at least a partial interest in Bulgarian literature is small as yet, but the very fact that such a conference as this one is taking place indicates that our numbers are growing and that communication among Bulgarian specialists is becoming more important. We enjoy the advantage of being free to investigate some areas which are still closed to the specialist in Bulgarian literature who must live and work in Bulgaria. Sometimes by raising certain questions we may encourage their discussion within Bulgaria; sometimes we may utilize materials published in Bulgaria to arrive at different conclusions than those reached by specialists inside Bulgaria. Sometimes the interests of Bulgarian and western scholars coincide, but they sometimes collide as well, and we should certainly feel under no obligation to confine our investigations to topics to the taste of Bulgaria's literary bureaucrats. Difficult though it may be to arrive at truth about the communist period of Bulgarian literary history (after all, when we investigate any period before 1944, we may usually return to the original documents and discard or ignore communist interpretations of them, but when we speak of post-1944 literature, even the original documents are distorted or lost because of the exigencies of ideology, in many cases), we may nevertheless accomplish some good in several areas. I should like to conclude this paper by singling out some of those which strike me as most suitable for future investigation.

We might start by looking more closely at the organizational history of Bulgarian literature during the transitional years after the ninth of September, when the party was consolidating its hold upon the levers of power in Bulgarian culture. The transformation of the Union of Bulgarian Writers into an instrument of political control over the years from 1944 to 1947 would probably be a worthy subject of investigation. It should also be enlightening to see what role such apparently non-communist organizations as the "Obshtestvo na svobodnite pisateli" played at that time, and outline the processes by which they were liquidated. This is obviously a touchy subject, and doubtless much of the truth about it can never be known, since many of the principal figures of those years are either dead or could not provide candid information on this topic. Still, using printed sources it should be possible to reconstruct the shape, if not the details, of the struggle for the consolidation of power in the Bulgarian literary world immediately after the war. Some of the non-communist periodicals, such as Konstantin Petkanov's Balkanski pregled, might supply useful information on similar topics; perhaps something no more complicated than a brief investigation of the histories of such journals themselves would yield material of interest. The library resources for the study of this period in the United States are very likely slim, but someone with access to what there is could make a valuable contribution to our understanding of literary processes at a time of intense stress.

I hesitate to recommend the study of the Stalinist period in any detail. The Stalinist years were intellectually so arid that literature at that time was merely a pale imitation of itself. The pattern is a familiar one which we have seen imposed upon many literatures in this unhappy century. Nevertheless, it might be profitable to delineate the history of the Stalinist era in literature during the worst years of intellectual conformity; more especially, it might be worthwhile to treat in some detail the confrontation between a work with some pretensions as good literature -- Dimitur Dimov's Tyutyun -- and the guardians of ideological orthodoxy who compelled its author to transform it into something it had no business being. The history of this sordid episode is a discouraging one, but it should be instructive as a case study of what happens when a writer with genuine talent runs afoul of the requirements of the political moment during a time when these requirements are strictly enforced.

A study of the thaw period from 1955 through 1957 ought to be interesting and varied. Those three years were a heady epoch, when literary men thought perhaps they would be able to proceed considerably further than they were in fact permitted to in the end. At the time, however, they could not foresee the future, and so talked and wrote as though the Stalinist period were entirely a thing of the past. The comments published by various literary men in the periodical press during 1955, the interplay between the highest party authorities and leading writers over the entire period, the publication of works which attempted to present a truthful picture of the domestic situation even while leaving the reader in no doubt as to the author's commitment to communism as a political system, the tightening of ideological controls during 1957, the reaction of the rebellion's leaders to this reasserted discipline, and an assessment of the lasting gains to have emerged from this transition -- all these deserve close investigation, and have in fact already been subjected to scrutiny (see the articles by Stefan Marinoff in Problems of Communism during 1956, or the short piece by Liliana Brisby in Survey for December 1961). From the perspective of fifteen years however, we should be able to arrive at a relatively accurate evaluation of the thaw's significance, even though we cannot yet write the definitive literary history of that time.

The tragedy of Pen'o Penev's suicide is a specific incident which, in my estimation, lays bare a fundamental contradiction between the theory and practice of communism. Penev was a true believer who had placed his faith in the achievement of a communist society, and whose lyric poems express this faith powerfully. Unlike the Christian, however, who believes in a non-terrestrial paradise of which he may obtain only the dimmest foretaste in this life, Penev was compelled to search for at least the beginnings of a spiritual transformation in the people around him, for his utopia was an earthly one. When he could detect no such transformation -- when, on the contrary, he saw that his fellow Bulgarians seemed to be becoming more petty and shallow than they had been before -- the gap between his beliefs and the reality his inborn honesty would not let him deny assumed such proportions that he could find no way out except self-destruction. Before he took this path, however, he left a moderately long poem expressing his disappointment. Though it has been published in Bulgaria, this is a poem which Bulgarian scholars must treat rather skittishly. There is no reason for western scholars to do the same. With his published writings and also Lyuben Georgiev's detailed biography of him, we have most of the material we need for an objective investigation of the tragedy of a true communist idealist. There are a certain number of Bulgarians who have believed deeply in the communist promise, there is an even larger group of people capable of assessing their surroundings with candor, but there are few indeed who combine belief with honesty. This was, I submit, a major cause of Penev's suicide, though surely not the only one. Let us contribute what we can toward an objective appraisal of Penev's unique case.

Many of those who observe reality with great honesty resort to the writing of satire. The place of satire in a communist literature is tenuous, and deserves a general treatment not limited to the history of Bulgarian letters alone. If literature is supposed to promote the building of a new society which will eventually be perfect, how are its imperfections of the moment to be viewed?

If writers are forbidden to discuss its shortcomings, the latter may not be brought to the attention of the authorities until they have developed into acute and major problems. If, on the other hand, writers go too far in satirizing the blunders of the current leadership, they cast doubt upon the wisdom of those who are guiding the nation toward future perfection. A society founded upon belief can ill afford this. So far communist regimes have not resolved the problem. Such satirists as Radoy Ralin and, to a lesser degree, Valeri Petrov, are grudgingly allowed to publish, but only if they make it clear that they are merely satirizing human foibles which will be eliminated upon the advent of the new society. Any attack upon current shortcomings must not be too bitter either, for otherwise it may call the wisdom of the leadership too obviously into question. Valeri Petrov has by and large chosen the safer course of satirizing personal failings. Ralin deals with subjects nearer to the interests of society as a whole, and consequently his books of poems and sketches are much in demand, but he also skates much closer to the menace of government retaliation. So far he has managed to avoid serious trouble, but he operates in tricky territory.

If a writer does not wish to deal with contemporary reality, he may escape into fantasy, expressed in the form, say, of science fiction or of pure fantasy, as in the case of Valeri Petrov's "play-grotesque" Kogato rozite tantsuvat of 1965. Petrov's piece was quite popular when presented upon the Sofia stage, although filled with allusions which it is difficult for a non-native to grasp. Such works as these may run along the lines delineated in Sinyavskii-Terts' essay "On Socialist Realism," in which he speaks of the necessity of a fantastic literature as the only one suitable for our epoch.

As we have seen, other writers, and especially members of the older generation, have resorted to the historical novel as a refuge from the demand that they deal with contemporary reality in the proper sense. Among historical novels, certainly a book like Vreme razdelno deserves study, as do such other works as Talev's Zhelezniyat svetilnik, Prespanskite kambani and Ilinden. Further, it should be profitable to investigate the historical novel as a genre in contemporary Bulgarian literature: let us see whether it has any noteworthy distinctive characteristics as contrasted with the pre-1944 historical novel. Is there a discernible difference in the authors' approaches to the historical novel during the two periods? These potential differences may turn out to be important: we may learn something about the interrelationships between art and ideology if it develops that novels in the two periods are quite different, but we would also learn something if it turns out that the two periods are essentially similar. The problem awaits more detailed study. Also, certain dramatic periods in Bulgarian history (the reign of Samuil, Ivaylo's rebellion, the fall of Bulgaria to the Turks, the struggle for the recovery of a sense of Bulgarian nationhood in the nineteenth century) have been treated by so many different writers that a comparative study of different reconstructions of the same period should be instructive.

Linked to the question of the historical novel is that of memoir writing, by literary men proper or else persons closely connected with them. Though this topic is only peripherally literary, the thirst for historical truth may well be the obverse of the coin of present truth suppressed. If this is so, then the enthusiasm for the historical novel in Bulgaria may also be an expression of the urge toward honesty in literature.

Honesty in the description of foreign lands, especially the United States, is something else which Bulgarian writers may be seeking. I have a personal predilection for analyzing the image of America as presented in Russian writings. Something similar might be done for Bulgaria. After all, the important thing for a Bulgarian is not what the west, including the United States, actually is, but what he thinks it is, and this mental image he forms largely through the instrumentality of belles-lettres. The tradition of travel literature got off to a good start in Bulgaria with Aleko Konstantinov's Do Chikago i nazad; it has continued in recent years, right down to such writings as Liliyana Stefanova's Edna esen v Amerika of 1964. Again, such works are only peripherally literary in most cases, but in the special instance of Bogomil Raynov artistic literature and the travel sketch join forces in an uncommon way. An investigation of Raynov's attitude toward foreign lands against the background of more conventional literature of travel may yield instructive results. At any rate it would give us a better idea of the way in which the average Bulgarian reader conceives of the outside world, which he is permitted to visit so infrequently if at all.

Another group of writers worth consideration are the younger poets of the last decade. They have diverged from the mainstream of communist literature, and seek to work out their own personal and poetic destinies. It is far too early to tell who among them will survive in the history of Bulgarian literature, but there can be no doubt of their considerable technical competence and their openness to new ideas. They do not exist in an historical vacuum, however, and it would be valuable to uncover their roots in Bulgarian and foreign poetic tradition. The younger generation of poets may furnish confirmation of George Orwell's theory that of all literary genres lyric poetry is best able to flourish under totalitarian regimes. If it had difficulties in surviving during the Stalinist years, at least now it is in the vanguard of the search for new values in Bulgarian literature, and it is a genre which attracts many young people.

Certain authors among those who have attained or retained prominence after 1944 surely deserve individual studies. Bulgarian specialists in the west have not reached the point where they can risk writing very many full-length monographs on contemporary Bulgarian writers, but we can at least devote substantial articles to some of them. The problem of selection in such situations must always be resolved subjectively, but I might suggest Dimitur Dimov, Emiliyan Stanev, Anton Donchev and Nikolay Khaytov as individual authors who should repay intensive study. I have already mentioned Pen 'o Penev as deserving investigation from an even more restricted viewpoint.

Finally, we might consider the question of the critic's role in contemporary Bulgarian letters. From the official point of view the critic ought to function as judge of how well a particular work or writer conforms to the political necessities of the moment. Writers and literary works have a curious way of evading conventional definitions which can baffle the critics, but they must, at least in theory, welcome new departures in art Still, the critic in communist society finds himself in a quandary. If a writer is very innovative he may go off into camouflaged ideological heresy, something in which the critic may scarcely encourage him. On the other hand, he cannot confine himself to fitting every author he encounters into the Procrustean bed of communist ideology, although some of the more doctrinaire Bulgarian critics are quite accomplished at this. Perhaps we as literary historians and critics might consider how we ourselves might react under Bulgarian conditions if we wished to be genuine literary critics, and not simply purveyors of ideology under another guise. The position of a true critic is not an easy one in Bulgaria today.

One subject Bulgarian critics have written about individually, but which we might do well to synthesize, is the conformism imposed upon literature during the Stalinist years, and the remnants of what they term "dogmatism" in Bulgarian literature today. Some interesting, though insufficiently detailed, pieces have appeared on this topic: I might mention Lozan Strelkov's article "Tvorcheski greshki s dulboki koreni," from his Zlatniyat zapas of 1959; Petur Pondev's "Za dogmatizma i za neshto drugo," an attack of 1961 upon Georgi Tsanev, to be found in his Literatura i narod: izbrani proizvedeniya (1964); and Veselin Yosifov's "Po glavnoto napravlenie," from Suvremennici (1963). The authors of such articles are concerned about the damage inflicted upon their native literature during the Stalinist period and seek to prevent a recurrence of anything so extreme, but on the other hand some, like Yosifov, feel that Bulgarian literature must not go too far in the opposite direction of making everything Bulgarian appear negative: "People who make life out better than it is," he writes in "Po glavnoto napravlenie," "like those who paint it in black colors, are unjust, inaccurate and improbable." Properly interpreted, this is a counsel of moderation from which any writer or critic could benefit. Perhaps by taking the insights of those Bulgarian critics who have written on Stalinism in literature and adding a few of our own we may arrive at a deeper comprehension of the well-springs of literary creation.

Despite the difficulties of investigating contemporary Bulgarian literature in any detail and depth, those among us who are drawn to this period will, I trust, give consideration to the topics I have mentioned here in planning their future researches. The history of literature under communism is a history of literature under extreme conditions, but it is precisely from the study of literature -- and men too, I might add -- under unusual circumstances that we may learn most about literature as art, and about the human condition itself.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Paper by Professor Moser

PINTO: Thank you. I very much enjoyed this fine paper. I am very interested in the issue of surrealism in Bulgarian literature, of which Svetoslav Minkov's "Edna mnogo stranna istoriya" is an excellent example. This current is even more striking in Minkov's "Chovekut s opashkata." Another writer of interest in this connection is Lankov -- Lenin appears in his dreams as his mother does, and he gives curious explanations of this.

PUNDEFF: An anthology of modern Bulgarian literature has already been published, and critical surveys have been put out by Free Europe. I enjoyed Professor Moser's review of the literary scene. On the other hand, you take party policy for granted in your discussion, whereas it seems to me party policy should be analyzed explicitly. For it participates actively on the "literary front", especially with its enforcement of the notion of _partiynost_, and has done so since 1944. This is not the same thing as socialist realism, because _partiynost_ is wholly identified with the party line.

BYNUM: _The Silent Don_ was socialist realism, but did not follow the party line.

MOZEJKO: Soviet writers have discussed socialist realism long and often at their congresses. Seminars are given on socialist realism with examples drawn from western writers. Socialist realism is the general concept, under which are subsumed _partiynost_ and _narodnost_. I believe myself that socialist realism is on the way out. It often leads toward romanticism. Romanticism is found in socialist realism because it is imposed by Soviet critics. My feeling is that something is happening to socialist realism anyway.

MOSER: This is not my favorite period.

SCATTON: Socialist realism is a tricky concept. Now that the party is in full control there is a great lack of independence. I am astonished at how strict people are in enforcing patriotic notions. Prof. Pinto mentioned the lively debates which occurred at an earlier time; the same thing happened in Russia; and yet one finds nothing of the sort going on today.

MOZEJKO: In Poland the notion of socialist realism has been abandoned. The same is true for Czechoslovakia. Socialist realism was mentioned by an official Polish spokesman for the last time in 1963.

LORD: Valeri Petrov is the son-in-law of Lyudmil Stoyanov, is he not? His position is quite secure.

MOSER: Yes, he is in a fairly solid position.

LORD: Radichkov's short stories are interesting, but I am drawn more to him from the stylistic point of view. On another point, how worthwhile is it to investigate the film? Radichkov is also interesting because of his surrealism.

BYNUM: I know the Yugoslav film rather well. They work on Kafkaesque premises, they imitate Fellini. "Chovekut s opashkata" is Kafkaesque. Is it possible to analyze this period in Bulgaria? It could be the reflection of a very worthwhile period.

SCATTON: Radichkov's writings are full of idyllic nature descriptions. Gulyashki is the same.

BYNUM: The identical thing may be said about Moravia. The element of the past and of religion is important.

ARONSON: I have been struck by the inferiority complex the Bulgarians suffer from. Writers are concerned about tradition and history as a means of building up the national image through historical novels. Socialist realism belongs to political science. Though some socialist realist novels can be good, there are others that belong to political science.

SCATTON: Writers like Talev want to prove that the Bulgarians were and are a remarkable people.

LORD: The evaluation of writers is a personal matter. Some may like Radichkov, others Talev.

PINTO: I would like to see the production of an anthology of satire.

MOSER: Satire is often difficult to translate into another culture. One has to understand the background from which it springs very well in order to appreciate it.

BYNUM: Travel literature would be of interest too, and there is plenty of it.

MOSER: I have always been interested in the notion of an anthology of Bulgarian or Soviet writings on the United States, since in this way we can obtain an idea of their image of us.

BUTKOFF: Have the members of the conference heard about two new items by Pen'o Penev, Vurnete ni zhivota and Putya? These are two poems only recently discovered.

PUNDEFF: Do we have any desire to keep track of underground literature? Certain people in New York claim to have such manuscripts in their possession. Bogomil Raynov deserves wider recognition, for he is a man of many skills, a publicist, translator, one who knows western literature. He seems to think significant thoughts. If we are to single out individuals for study, he certainly should be considered.

MOSER: The individual writers I think worthy of major investigation are Debelyanov, Yovkov and Elin Pelin.

PUNDEFF: An article on Yovkov recently appeared in a German journal.

SCATTON: How are we to promote good Bulgarian authors, who are not very numerous? Then how are we to interest students in the rest?

MOSER: Yovkov is in fact a very difficult writer, who must be read with great care.

LORD: We shall have to paint in the cultural background for the students' reference. They cannot do this for themselves, but without it they cannot determine which writers are worthwhile.

SCATTON: There are not many sources of supply for the books we are interested in.

ARONSON: The most disappointing thing about Soviet literature is that it produces no books one can read before going to bed. Literature as pastime does not exist in the Soviet Union, and translations of such literature are few.

PUNDEFF: Very few writers worthy of Nobel prizes appear under communist regimes. Why should this be?

SCATTON: That is a good question. It is difficult for a first-rate talent to develop in communist societies. One has to possess considerable fortitude to write well in such countries. The Bulgarians themselves say they are a nation of sheep.

ARONSON: Solzhenitsyn has been able to get his writings published in the west.

MOSER: In all the Eastern European countries except Bulgaria there have appeared writers who protested openly against the regime or have emigrated.

LORD: What do we know, for example, about Dutch literature? We must have conferences on small nations which have produced fine literature. All countries belong to the family of nations.

ARONSON: In the Soviet Union an effort is made to survey the literatures of all countries. In the United States we hear of European writers only after they have become famous in Great Britain. Americans do not translate many European writers. World literature is completely neglected in our high schools.

PUNDEFF: Such programs exist in the Soviet Union because the government promotes them.

MOSER: Are we arriving at any conclusions?

LORD: I have taught little known literatures for many years. Students accept them willingly because they are intersted in them. Many of them have been fascinated even by Babylonian literature.

ARONSON: World literature is included in the programs of Soviet high schools, but that is not the case in this country.

PINTO: The situation in England is no better.

MOSER: We lack a tradition of the study of world literature.

MOZEJKO: Canada does attempt to promote the study of world literature.

PINTO: Is there a good bibliography of Bulgarian literature? An English scholar is doing research on such a thing.

PUNDEFF: There do exist bibliographies of Bulgarian literature in English.

SCATTON: The word has not yet reached Indiana.

PUNDEFF: The Bulgarian Studies Group can work at promoting publishing, but this conference should come up with some concrete recommendations.

PINTO: First we shall have to get more books from Bulgaria.

PUNDEFF: This conference is the first of its kind in the west. If we can find a way to synthesize what has been said here we may arrive at a definition of what it is desirable to do. Also, we must encourage the exchange of information and opinion among scholars in the field of Bulgarian studies.

BYNUM: Some university might be found to finance positions and collect books and bibliographies. If we are to publish a book it must be worthwhile.

PINTO: Perhaps we ought to think of a series of literary studies in which we might interest a publisher.

PUNDEFF: That sort of thing has already been done here.

BYNUM: We need a basic treatise on European folklore which would include a section on Bulgarian folklore.

LORD: If this question is important to the world at large, let us present things to it and allow it to decide.

MOSER: It is too bad we lack a library of translations from Bulgarian literature.
LORD: Many of the extant translations are poor. Often either the book itself or the translation is poor, for political reasons.
PUNDEFF: Let us attempt to establish good contacts with publishing houses.
BYNUM: And let us make sure that when a work is once translated it will not soon be necessary to retranslate it.
PUNDEFF: Yes, let us be certain the task is done well the first time.

SUGGESTIONS BY PARTICIPANTS:

1. An anthology of Bulgarian literature.

2. Individual studies of Yovkov and Bagryana.

3. Good translations of Bulgarian literature (outstanding authors and individual works), if possible with the assistance of Bulgarian publishing houses.

4. A basic treatise on European folklore with a section on Bulgaria.

5. A series of literary and cultural studies on Bulgaria like those on other countries. A study of the links between Bulgarian and western European literature.

6. A bio-bibliographical guide to Bulgarian literature.

7. A union list of Bulgarian periodicals in U.S. libraries.

9. A one-volume encyclopedia of Bulgaria.

10. An investigation of nationalism in Bulgarian literature.

11. Dimitur Blagoev as a literary critic.

Bulgarian Language and Literature in the Context of Slavic and Balkan Area Studies

by

Howard I. Aronson
University of Chicago

The question of the place of Bulgarian language and literature in the context of Slavic and Balkan area studies is one that can be attacked from many and varied points of view. The first point of view, the objective importance of Bulgarian as a Slavic and as a Balkan language within the field of studies of these areas, probably needs little further comment, certainly before this distinguished group. But, we can ask, to what extent is Bulgarian actually represented in American Slavic and Balkan studies? The answer is known to all of us. Bulgaria is the least represented of all the Slavic national states. For example, within American Slavic departments we find, obviously, Russian as the most widely taught language and literature. Russian is followed by Polish, Serbocroatian, Czech, and, a very poor fifth, Bulgarian. What is the reason for this? Is it a reflection of the intrinsic importance of Bulgarian vis-a-vis the other Slavic languages? Obviously not. It is a reflection of the pattern of growth of Slavic language and literature studies in the United States in the post-World-War II and, especially, the post-sputnik periods. The non-Russian offerings of Slavic departments tended to be determined by the numbers of emigre Poles, Yugoslavs, Czechoslovaks, and Bulgarians who earned advanced degrees in Slavic. Even today, fourteen years (or perhaps three generations of graduate students) after sputnik, the teaching of these languages is still being carried on overwhelmingly by native speakers of the languages in question (Bulgarian, interestingly enough, forms the only exception to this rule). I mention this, not out of an isolationist, America for the Americans spirit, but to point out the fact that we have failed to a very significant extent to train new cadres to continue developing the non-Russian field of Slavic studies.

Why has this been? For if my contention is true, then it certainly has far-reaching consequences for Bulgarian studies. One of the major reasons, I believe, has been the frightening lack of integration within Slavic studies. Let us take literature as an example. A student whose major, real interest is in nineteenth-century Russian literature feels himself forced into a literature in which he has no initial interest and which is almost always treated in total isolation from Russian and general Slavic literature. The relevance of Polish, Czech, Serbocroatian, Bulgarian literature to his major interest is never pointed out. Slavic literature is all too often the sum of courses in individual Slavic literatures with no synthesizing, with no attempt at viewing Slavic literature as anything but a collection of literatures which happen to be written in genetically related languages. Mutatis mutandis, much the same can be said for the field of Balkan literature. As a matter of fact, the Slavic and Balkan worlds offer one of the most challenging areas for a true comparative literature, a comparative literature in which Bulgarian literature would be of the greatest interest.

I believe that specialists in Slavic literature (or literatures) have much to learn from their colleagues in linguistics. The field of Slavic linguistics in America has shown a much greater concern with comparative Slavic studies (and not only in historical terms) than has literature.

Another cause of the relatively underdeveloped status of the so-called second Slavic languages may lie in the fact that we have not been teaching these languages in the most efficient manner possible. Let us analyze the following : students entering graduate school after four years of undergraduate Russian are still far from fluent in that language, they still have great difficulty in reading Russian without continual recourse to a dictionary. As I have said elsewhere, they are jacks of all four language skills, masters of none. If these are the results of four years of study of Russian, the most developed of the Slavic languages in terms of textbooks, readers, and other pedagogical materials, you can well imagine what the results of one (or two) years of a second Slavic language may be. Without successful and efficient language training we cannot hope to develop literary (or other) studies in our graduate programs.

This brings us to the very real needs we have for text materials for students of Bulgarian language, literature, etc.. Perhaps foremost today among our needs are introductory works on Bulgarian history, literature, culture, which will expose students of Slavic (and of other disciplines) to what Bulgaristics has to offer. Let it be noted here parenthetically that there appears to me to be little rhyme or reason in the way entering graduate students are led to choose their second Slavic languages. This decision may be made on the basis of which language is offered at the most convenient time, the particular biases of a given advisor, the fact that the student had just seen a good Polish (or Czech, or Yugoslav) film. Seldom, if ever, is the choice based on knowledge. I would even go so far as to conjecture that many of our graduate students making this choice would be hard put to locate some of the Slavic states on an unmarked map. I, for example, would take the attitude that it is worthwhile studying Bulgarian simply to be able to read Elisaveta Bagrjana and Nikola Vapcarov in the original, but how many Ph.D.'s in Slavic languages and literatures have ever even heard of these two writers? In a word, I am claiming that to speak of "Slavic studies" in most American universities is a gross exaggeration. We can speak of Russian studies, Polish studies, Serbocroatian studies, but Slavic studies --- no! And it must be admitted that Bulgarian language, literature, and culture, perhaps, suffers from this lack the most of all.

It is perhaps a futile exercise today to complain about the undeserved lack of attention to Bulgaristics in American Slavic departments, for we are faced by a far greater crisis today. I refer to the ever decreasing interest in Slavic studies that we are currently witnessing. This presents perhaps the greatest threat to Bulgarian studies. First of all we must recognize that practically all of Slavic studies draws its cadres from students in undergraduate programs who are studying Russian. We are all, alas, too aware of the decreasing enrolment in Russian language courses. Now we are faced with the prospect of a gradual (or, perhaps, rapid) erosion of undergraduate foreign language requirements. And with the going of the undergraduate foreign language requirement we shall lose the opportunity of interesting future generations of students in our field. Perhaps we might ask why the foreign language requirements are disappearing. This process began, I believe, in the student power days of the sixties when students began demanding the realization of the "relevancy" that our academic structure, perhaps unwisely, had promised, but all too often had not delivered. Foreign language studies were clearly irrelevant, because in the two year required sequence of foreign language study the student seldom acquired sufficient mastery of any skill (let alone all four skills) to use that language as a tool, and, perhaps more significantly, was never asked to use what knowledge he had acquired once he completed the required sequence. Richard D. Lambert's report Language and Area Studies Programs Review indicates "the low degree of language use in any of the (area) courses, in the very few courses that require of the student any language competence at all." (VI-54) "The relatively low degree of language use in courses reflects not just the fact that most area courses are taught so that nonspecialists will feel at home in them, but the fact that neither the specialist students nor their professors in a number of world areas can use these languages with sufficient ease to make classroom use feasible." (VI-56). These conclusions apply to the general, overall picture of area studies. If we take a look at Lambert's data for Eastern Europe, we find the following rather disheartening picture: (VI-55a)

Language Use in Area Courses by World Area

Eastern Europe

CODED COURSES	No.	%
No language use	1337	70.8
Some required reading in language	178	9.4
All or most reading in language	271	14.3
Language as medium of instruction	31	1.7
Uncodable	72	3.8

To save our field, then, we must concentrate our efforts on making certain that our students gain some usable skill or skills from their two-year introductory foreign language sequences and that they be made to use the skills there acquired outside of the language classroom. And we can be sure that the better, the more efficiently, and the more thoroughly our students learn Russian, the better, the more efficiently and the more rapidly they will acquire command of Bulgarian.

In discussing the question of students and their needs we must face the fact that in recent years in America there has been a certain faddishness in students' choices of areal programs. There can be no doubt that Slavic studies rode on the crest of post-sputnik dognat'-i-peregnat'ism; strange as it may seem, the Beatles' use of the sithar and pilgrimages to the Maharishi turned one generation of university students on to South Asia studies. The president's upcoming trip to the Chinese Peoples Republic will likely send enrolments in Chinese language and Far East studies zooming. Still in terms of this faddishness, let it be mentioned that all area studies programs in general, but Slavic area studies in particular, have a very, very strong Cold War taste about them. If we combine the current preoccupation in America with internal problems (the so-called neo-isolationism) with our students' distrust of Cold-Warism, the possibilities of interesting undergraduates in the East European field will become ever more limited unless we stop and reexamine our external image.

Area studies may also be losing their battle for survival due to what appears to be an ever-growing preference for the "disciplinary generalist" as against the "area specialist." The Lambert Report (I-5) characterizes the former as having "superior theoretical and methodological -- especially quantitative -- skills" in the eyes of its supporters. The Lambert Report goes on in the following not overly reassuring words (I-4): "Educationally, the innovative appeal of the area studies model has lessened as higher education moves to lop off "frills" invented by any generation of students or faculty but the present one, universities focus more attention on undergraduates and seek to become more "relevant," more domestic-issue-, and more problem-solving-oriented. Area studies programs and particularly their language courses are endangered as raising of student-faculty ratios becomes a means of budget balancing for university administrators."

And so we find the future fate of Bulgarian studies in America not so much inextricably bound up with as dependent upon the fate of Russian, the fate of Slavic area studies, and the fate of area studies in general in this brave new world of the seventies we are entering. I must confess that I cannot right now look forward with anything even approaching optimism. On the other hand, in all honesty, I must say that to a very great extent we, collectively, as area specialists or as Slavicists, deserve the bitter fate that may be awaiting us in the near future.

Having come to this point of gloom and doom, I should now like to turn to the more specific question of the place of Bulgarian language and literature in our Balkan and/or Slavic universes, on which topic I promise to be no more optimistic than I have been up to now.

There are certain areas of Bulgarian studies which offer the potential of major contributions to our understanding of the Slavic languages. Unfortunately, these areas are unlikely to be developed in the United States today. One such topic that comes immediately to this linguist's mind is the question of the development of the modern Bulgarian literary language, a question of great importance in modern Bulgarian research, but one, it can be said, still awaiting its resolution. Hinging upon the answer to this question is the greater question of variant and invariant in the development of the various Slavic literary languages, a possible typology of literary language development, and, perhaps, a theory of literary language development. I choose this just as an example to point out that it is, relatively speaking, unlikely that a future American Bulgarist would undertake such a project because it involves a thorough grounding not only in the history and structure of Bulgarian, but an equally thorough background in the history of Bulgarian literature. In other words, it bridges linguistics and literary history, when the dominant trend in American Slavistics is more and more becoming compartmentalization. A student of Bulgarian literature is generally incapable of teaching Bulgarian linguistics and a student of Bulgarian linguistics is most unlikely to be found teaching courses in Bulgarian (or any other) literature. It would be ideal if we could produce philologists with a competence in Bulgarian since so many of the most interesting avenues of needed research in this area involve the intersection of linguistics and literature.

Another set of questions perhaps well worth asking might be: to what extent is it realistic to talk about South Slavic literature; about Balkan literature? Again, are there certain invariant characteristics in the South Slavic literatures (or the Balkan literatures) which not only justify an areal approach but which give promise of fruitful research? Or is the areal approach just not relevant when we begin talking about literature? To answer such a basic question again requires a background that is not parochial. It involves a course of preparation which most of our departments are either unable or unwilling to provide.

The question last posed can lead to other speculation. In what ways are we over-circumscribing our field when we limit ourselves to Bulgaristics in a Slavic and Balkan context? In certain fields or in certain areas of certain fields we must talk about Bulgarian in a European context, at other times of a Western European context, yet other times of a Soviet context. So, for example, I have found it extremely insightful and interesting for my own purposes to compare Bulgarian with Georgian and point out typological similarities and universal implications resulting from this comparison. But this of course in no way diminishes the importance of typological comparisons between the Bulgarian and Macedonian literary languages, or between Bulgarian and Rumanian.

I must confess that I have been rather uneasy about my title throughout this paper. As a linguist I know what is meant by Slavic: a set of genetically related languages having a common ancestor which in turn was one of the daughter-branches of Indoeuropean. I, again qua linguist, understand the term Balkan: a geographical area with distantly related languages which have through the process of convergeance arrived at a common typological structure. The terms "Slavic" and "Balkan" then are basically linguistic terms ("Balkan", of course, also being a geographical term). To what extent are we justified in extending these terms to literature, history, sociology, music, folklore, etc.? This question needs to be asked both synchronically and diachronically. It may be that in certain time-spans for certain disciplines these terms have validity and that for other time-spans they do not. I am not an expert in these fields, and may be very much mistaken, but it is my impression that these questions have probably not been asked except for folklore and perhaps music. Whatever the resultant anwsers may be, the questions are worth asking, and it is obvious that Bulgarian studies will play an essential role in the determination of the answers.

Without waiting for an answer to the above questions, we can accept the existence of Slavic and Balkan area centers as administrative units and again ask what role Bulgaristics should play therein and what role Slavic and Balkan studies should play in the training of a Bulgarist. The role of Bulgarian in American Slavistics has been thoroughly surveyed in Charles Jelavich's Language and Area Studies: East Central and Southeastern Europe, A Survey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1969), and so need not be repeated here, except to mention that, as with most other countries of the area, treatment seems to be very often on a one course, one country basis, and courses with more of an areal encompass tend to be rare. If, in looking at the data in the Jelavich survey, one were to come to the conclusion that Bulgarian studies are underrepresented, it is nonetheless quite clear that in the present period of academic crisis, a period which, because of various demographic considerations, will last at least throughout the 1970's, very little can or will be done to alleviate or improve the situation. I must therefore close by repeating the hope that we can all begin working seriously toward the creation of real Slavic studies, comparative, typological, synchronic, and diachronic, studies which will not only give to Bulgarian its proper place but do much to strengthen and advance our field within the universities.

Judging by William E. Harkins' contribution to the Jelavich survey, little has been done in America on Bulgarian literature. At the time of that survey the only volume Harkins could (or did) cite was Manning and Smal-Stocki's unfortunate History of Modern Bulgarian Literature (1960). (Jelavich, 319). In Stankiewicz's survey of Bulgarian linguistics in Jelavich the situation is somewhat better. Among authors during the survey period writing articles dealing primarily with Bulgarian were Klagstad, Van Campen, Ornstein, Aronson, Stankiewicz, and Bidwell (Jelavich, 387). In terms of textbook material we can cite Hodge's FSI Bulgarian: Basic Course, which, it is to be hoped, serves our diplomats in good stead in Sofia, but is of little use for American Slavicists, Lord's Beginning Bulgarian, and Lord and Bynum's Bulgarian Literary Reader (Jelavich, 440).

It must be noted, however, that there were (and to a certain extent are) very real factors which made Bulgarian not the most attractive area of specialization for an American. First, because there were few specialists in the area in America it was unlikely that one would become turned on to Bulgaria. Bulgaria, it must be admitted, did little to help. We have not yet seen the golden age of Bulgarian cinema here; yet it cannot be denied that the flowering of Polish, Czech, and Yugoslav cinema did much to arouse interest in those countries. The fact that for many years Bulgaria was virtually inaccessible to American scholars did not help, either. There were political problems too, and these still exist. Any sign of what might be construed as recognition of a Macedonian literary language could well make one persona non grata in Bulgaria. It is obvious, though, that recognition of the existence of a Bulgarian literary language would not be cause for consternation in Skopje.

In the field of literature, again, we seem to run into a communication gap between Bulgaria and the West. Whereas it is clear, to me at least, that such modern Bulgarian writers as Jordan Radichkov and even Andrej Guljashki might excite the interest of American students, the Bulgarians feel a moral obligation to push Botev, Vazov, and uvi, Dimov. This is not an atypical Slavic syndrome. One need only compare the reaction of most American students to Mickiewicz's Pan Tadeusz with what might be regarded as the Polish establishment view of that work. It remains, nonetheless, true that literary nationalism enjoys its greatest popularity in its own homeland.

These are, I believe, some of the factors which can be adduced to explain the relatively little work done on Bulgaria in this country. Some of these factors are relatively minor, others are of greater importance. But, I cannot help but feel that this should not be cause for dismay. The relatively undeveloped state of Bulgarian studies in America presents us with a rare opportunity to undertake bolder and more venturesome projects than are possible in better developed fields. This is all the more true because the basic approaches to literature, the types of questions asked in Bulgaria will tend to be quite different than the approaches and questions of American specialists. In this sense, one can talk of a certain complementarity of interests between American and Bulgarian scholars, a complementarity which can only be beneficial to scholarship.

In the realm of linguistics we are often hampered by a lack of data that can only come from Bulgaria (and, most likely, from Bulgarians). In particular, we are almost totally lacking data about the form of Bulgarian spoken by educated speakers from Sofia. Unfortunately, Bulgarian linguistics tends to preoccupy itself with normative questions, which often have no relation whatsoever to how the language is actually spoken. This can lead to what amount to Scheinproblemen in the West. So, for example, the question of whether Bulgarian has distinctive palatalization or not centered around whether one was considering the official codified, normative literary language, which, ex definitio, has distinctively palatalized consonants, or native Sofians (i.e., Western Bulgarians) attempting to reproduce the obligatory palatalization of the literary language with about as much success as an American student in first year Russian.

The lack of complete codification of the Bulgarian literary language leads to other problems. Since the literary language is based primarily upon an earlier stage of the orthography, and not upon any actually spoken dialects, it becomes at times dufficult to treat it as a coherent, integrated system. One thing, however, is certain, and that is that the future will bring a literary language quite different from today s artificial, codified norm. Strangely enough, it is the non-Bulgarian observer, the Western linguist, who is more likely to observe and describe these tendencies than the native linguist who has been trained to view reduction of unstressed /a, o, e/ as "dialectal."

The linguistic problems (which, within the Slavic world, may well be unique to Bulgarian) have a quite real consequence in the area of language teaching. Just what is one to teach? Is the Bulgarian for yoghurt *kiselo mljako* as the Academy would insist, or is it *kiselo mleko* as almost everyone in Sofia (with perhaps the exception of Professor Andrejchin) would say? Is the plural of *armija*/armij/ as Hodge's basic course would have it, or is it /armii/ as the Academy insists? In a word, do we teach Bulgarian as it is spoken, or as it is decreed? And this is *not* an easy question to answer. It is a question that demands a thorough linguistic and pedagogic analysis, and what the ultimate answer would be is almost unpredictable.

This does not even raise the question of *what* one is to teach in Bulgarian language courses. Should one concentrate on all four skills (speaking, reading, writing, comprehension) in the one year at our disposal (thereby assuring that the student will not acquire any of these skills) or should we concentrate just on speaking and comprehension or just on reading? All too often this decision is made without any serious thought whatever, on the basis of what textbooks are available; on the basis of how the instructor learned his French, or German, or Russian; on the basis of the latest fad being pushed by the pedagogical establishment in cahoots with Washington, a miracle-working "method" that applies equally well to all the languages taught in the university.

We must face still other questions. To what extent should a Bulgarist in a Slavic department be trained in areas traditionally not covered within such a department? That is to say, to what extent should the student be trained in the history of Bulgaria, Bulgarian folklore, etc., etc. (And, to what extent are the Russian specialists that we are turning out trained in such areas?)

I continually come to the same conclusions, no matter in which direction I turn. The problems before the field of Bulgarian studies in America hardly differ at all from the problems facing all the other Slavic languages in our American Slavic programs. The solution to our problems cannot be sought in growth and expansion any more; the period of growth and expansion will not return for at least a decade. Our solutions must lie in a reallocation of available assets, in integrating what have turned out to be rather atomistic collections of courses which share in common only the fact that they deal with some aspect of countries which happen to be located in Eastern Europe. The Czechs had a word for what we need: *vzajemnost*.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Paper by Professor Aronson

MOSER: Please tell us about the Balkan Institute with which you are associated, since it was founded on the concept of an area institute.

ARONSON: The institute was begun at an unfortunate time, at a point when sociologists began their studies of criminology and interest in statistical and quantitative analysis mounted. This was accompanied by a decline in interest in such things as Slavic languages and literatures. In order to do a good job we need a return to philology in the old sense. The Balkan area program is successful only in linguistics.

PINTO: Rumania is included in the Balkans.

LORD: On the other hand, when the Slavic department at Harvard was reorganized it was set up along Slavic and not Russian lines; but then the linguists spoiled this by breaking off from the Slavists. It is very good that we are once again talking about philology. I should like to comment that some very good conferences on the Balkans have been held in the Balkans, but there it turned out that western scholars knew more about the Balkans as a whole than did scholars from individual Balkan countries. Such gatherings are very beneficial for both western and Balkan scholars.

ARONSON: Basically I was speaking only of American students. At Harvard the situation is different, for there folklore serves as a unifying factor. Students are tremendously interested in the cinema, and films imported from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia help stimulate student interest in these countries. Slavic is the only western area that has a philological tradition. The philological approach here was successful at the beginning, just after the war when people arrived from Europe. But how many Russian majors at the moment are teaching that which they are best qualified to teach?

SCATTON: Russian majors are now often tempted to acquire a second Slavic language, and many who have taken advanced degrees now say they found it highly useful. We must impel students to study second Slavic languages even though many do not wish to on the grounds that it is irrelevant to them. Many students do not want to study linguistics or the historical development of a language because they believe these have nothing to do with literature.

PUNDEFF: The administration at my university has supported courses in Balkan history along with language. We must interpret the significance of the Balkans to other areas. I am pleased to hear that philology is once again to be understood in the old way. Times of stress like today bring us back to philology. The Balkans provide us with the classical case of Slavic culture. In order to understand Slavic civilization deeply we must know about its sources in the Balkans. I endorse this reorientation toward philology. We should not attempt to attract students with films and fads, for this would only bring us to a dead end in a couple of years.

ARONSON: To a certain extent the foundations of Slavic studies in this country have been badly laid. And European history is not just west European history; it includes the Balkans as well. It is ridiculous when students want to work on Dostoevsky but must spend four years studying Russian in order to achieve this. Our task is to get students into fi -year Russian.

PUNDEFF: The student feedback I get indicates that students look on linguistics as a barrier to language learning.

LORD: Students can begin Russian in their freshman year and study it for three years and still not be able to read. That is the fault of the linguists who teach the language.

ARONSON: I see no point in students' being taught pure grammar. Grammar is not essential.

LORD: It is impossible to find a perfect teaching method for languages. We simply have to send them to the country in which the language is spoken after they have acquired its rudiments.

SCATTON: We reorganized our language offerings and discovered that a genuinely good method for teaching Russian did not exist. Some courses were taught by native speakers who only wanted to see to it that their students acquired good pronunciation. Nobody is encouraged to work on a language textbook. People who write textbooks have to do it on their own, without much help.

ARONSON: Students do not have to know all the grammar, but only that which is necessary for an active command of the language, the structure of the language. Pronunciation is not so important.

SALTER: On the contrary, they will have to know the grammar because in the future they must teach it.

SCATTON: Even among students with more than one year of Russian, some drop and some continue. What they study for a second Slavic language depends on the nature of their Russian program.

ARONSON: We train people to be linguists but not teachers, which is a mistake. Our programs do not fit students' needs. The language taught to chemistry and physics majors is not the same as that taught to other students.

SCATTON: If a student is to do serious research in Slavic literature, he must know a second Slavic language.

LORD: I have taken people with only a year of Serbian into my literature course. Everything depends on our aims. We want to teach them to read literature. The major language, Russian, provides them with the fundamentals.

ARONSON: We must concentrate on major aims. Scientists should study Russian.

SCATTON: Scientists are interested in Russian. However, they begin it and then drop out because so many translations are available in their fields.
BYNUM: Every subject must be offered in a way adapted to the needs and the level of the students.
SCATTON: I have found that a number of undergraduates have been ready to begin a second Slavic language, and this certainly helps their careers.
LORD: This is likewise the case at Harvard.
ARONSON: Bulgarian is the only Slavic language taught primarily by non-natives.
PUNDEFF: Is it possible to have a bread-and-butter course in Bulgarian?
ARONSON: We do this at Chicago without teaching any grammar. By the end of the fifth week we take up Pinto's reader, by the tenth week we can read almost anything. Bulgarian vocabulary is easy to acquire.
PINTO: Bulgarian is easier for English-speaking people because it has no cases.
ARONSON: Still, students often elect Bulgarian as a second Slavic language in ignorance of what they are doing. We must develop better methods of advising students about a second Slavic language.
PINTO: At London University we organize circles and invite native speakers to attend. Along with a historian who knows Greek, I conduct a seminar on Bulgarian and Greek literature.
LORD: We need a project-approach to draw together humanities and social science departments at universities in Boston. Such a project might be an investigation of the peasant in Eastern Europe; specialists from all disciplines might approach this topic from varying angles. Specialists in sociology and literature would be welcome to work together. But in order to obtain students we need scholarships and a chair in Bulgarian literature.
BYNUM: Such a project works very well.
ARONSON: I do not think it would work very smoothly.
PUNDEFF: Let us promote Balkan history courses through our individual institutions. Russian studies got its start in this country in that way.
PINTO: What is genuinely interesting here is political history, but it is that we are trying to move away from.
MOSER: Have we any concrete resolutions or recommendations? If not, thank you for attending this first working conference on twentieth century Bulgarian literature. It is good that we have established personal communication now in order to promote the interests of Bulgarian literature. Let us hope this conference will stimulate interest in Bulgaria, especially now that a larger number of Americans are studying Bulgarian. We have advanced considerably since Professor Lord first began some twenty years ago in this field in the United States.
LORD: I should like to express my gratitude to Professor Moser for his hospitality and for his work in organizing this conference to encourage Bulgarian studies in America.
PUNDEFF: We trust that this will not be the last conference of this type.
MOSER: My thanks to you all. You will receive the materials of the conference as soon as they are reproduced.

TWENTIETH CENTURY BULGARIAN LITERATURE:

RESOURCES FOR ITS STUDY

by
Marin Pundeff
San Fernando Valley State College

Preliminary Remarks

It is generally a good idea to begin by defining terms, but in this case it seems imperative to do so, since Bulgarian historians of literature as a rule do not periodize the history of Bulgarian literature by centuries and the term "Twentieth Century Bulgarian Literature" has no currency among the litterateurs -- the writers, critics, and scholars --- in Bulgaria.[1] What, then, is twentieth century Bulgarian literature? When does the twentieth century begin in Bulgarian literature? Is the answer simply chronological -- the year 1900 -- when, symbolically speaking, "nineteenth century Bulgarian literature" died with the death of one of its typical representatives the poet, linguist, and public figure, Naiden Gerov, and the birth of three of the representative faces on the literary stage in the new century, Nikolai Marangozov, Mariia Grubeshlieva, and Magda Petkanova? Or is the answer much more complex in that it might require an examination of the entire panorama of Bulgarian literature as it existed at the chronological start of the twentieth century and identification of what was old and "nineteenth century" in it and what was making its appearance as new, modern, "twentieth century" on the literary scene?

---

[1] Both the "bourgeois" and Marxist historians of Bulgarian literature distinguish between "stara" (old, medieval) and "nova" (new, modern) Bulgarian literarure, the watershed being usually, but by no means uniformly, taken as the middle of the eighteenth century and the time that produced Paissii's Istoriia Slavianobulgarska in 1762. Within the new Bulgarian literature the dividing lines are again usually seen in the liberation of the country in 1878, the end of World War I, and, since the coming of the Communists to power, 1944. For example, Boian Penev reached in his massive Istoriia na novata bulgarska literatura from the earliest beginnings of the national revival to 1878 before he died prematurely in 1927; Bozhan Angelov adopted in his Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura (2nd revised edition, 1933) "from Paisii to the liberation" and "from the liberation to the present" as subdivisions of "the new literature;" an identical approach was taken by Georgi Konstantinov in his Nova bulgarska literatura; the four-volume Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura (1962-) being currently produced in the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences' Institute of Literature and representing a Marxist consensus, has adopted the division between old and new literature, with the dividing line in the middle of the eighteenth century, and proposes to add a third period beginning in 1944 while dividing the second period of the "New Bulgarian Literature" into "Literature of the National Revival" and "Literature from the Liberation to September 9, 1944."

I am afraid the answer is rather complex, and since my task is to discuss the resources rather than the periodization of the field, I shall venture only a brief attempt to provide one for the purpose of this paper. The problem will undoubtedly be dealt with in some of the other papers as well as in the general discussion with the thoroughness and sophistication it deserves.

From the perspective of Bulgarian general history, it is an often-repeated truism that the liberation in 1878 has an enormous impact on the life of the nation. However, while this is manifestly the case in politics and economics, in literature the effect of the attainment of freedom has tended to be overstated. For some two decades after 1878 Bulgarian literature remained on the same main track it had found before 1878: a Bulgarian type of narodnichestvo, which drew its ideology of service to the people from native instincts and sources, beginning with Paisii, as well as from the Russian Narodnichestvo many Bulgarians had come to know while studying in Russia. All of the great names of the period -- Rakovski, Petko Slaveikov, Karavelov, Botev -- evoke this "literature of civic duty," this general effort, in a variety of literary forms, to be useful to one's people and to promote its political, intellectual, and educational progress. Unlike its Russian counterpart, however, the Bulgarian narodnichestvo was almost synonymous with patriotism and nationalism since the oppressors and exploiters of the narod in the Bulgarian case were foreigners, and in the conditions of an ethnic unit lacking Russia's social stratification and using a still primitive language, narod was the political and linguistic equivalent of "nation." There was, to be sure, a realization ever since Paisii's chastisement of some Bulgarians for turning Greek that the well-to-do chorbadzhii tended to have divergent interests from those of the narod and even inimical to them, but the numbers of the chorbadzhii were small and the themes of social conflict within the ethnic unit remained secondary to the main theme of national advancement. It was only toward the end of the pre-liberation period, with Karavelov and especially Botev, that the internal social antagonisms began to be stressed, but of the two only Botev became, as the sole self-styled Communist before the liberation, committed to social revolution. In any case, his death in 1876 and Karavelov's in 1879 removed the two major talents who might have added a "socialist" dimension to Bulgarian literature in the years immediately following the liberation.

As it was, those years were marked by continuity rather than radical change, and no one personified this continuity better than Petko Slaveikov who had been swayed into a long and multi-faceted career of narodnichestvo after reading Paisii in 1842 and continued to apply his ingenious pen to the cause of populism, democracy, nad nationalism long after 1878. The man who carried Bulgarian literature along the established track well into the twentieth century, however, was Vazov, a young face on the literary stage in the 1870's whose talent blossomed out in the ensuing decade and was to establish him as Bulgaria's greatest writer and poet. In the span of these two decades Vazov witnessed and shared in the nation's surge toward freedom, the joy of having attained it with the help of Russia, the dismemberment of the nation at the Congress of Berlin, the first and victorious war for national unity in 1885. At each turn of events in the nation's life he responded from the established, vuzrozhdenski positions and values and in unpretentious literary forms and language that won him a wide popular audience while still in his thirties.

The work that established Vazov as the central literary figure by 1890 was, of course, Pod Igoto, published in the first three volumes (1889-1890) of Sbornik za Narodni Umotvoreniia, Nauka i Knizhnina, launched and edited by the young professor of literature, Ivan Shismanov, who was imbued with the same vuzrozhdenski views and values. Written in the mood, prevalent in the 1880's, of reminiscing about the recent heroic past and "how freedom was won," Pod Igoto depicted in roman form Bulgarian life in typical provincial small-town setting as it moved in the traditional patriarchal system and was hit by the storm of the April Uprising in 1876. The combination of effective and affirmative portrayal of the traditional way of life with the epic of the struggle for freedom made Pod Igoto the most widely read Bulgarian novel, winning its author also recognition abroad, with its first of many translations appearing in English and Swedish in 1894. Vying with Vazov in popularity, though not in literary talent, was Zakhari Stoianov, whose Zapiski po bulgarskite vustaniia were primarily eyewitness history and, together with his romanticized biographies of Levski, Botev, and other "apostles of Bulgarian liberty," made him the most popular raconteur of the national epic long after his sudden and premature death in 1889.

The literary Establishment dominated by Vazov was, however, not without its challengers and mavericks. In the decade of the 1890's the challenges to its traditionalism, affirmation of the way of life and virtues of smalltown Bulgaria, simplicity of language, ethnocentrism, and nationalism became increasingly vocal and well articulated. The challenges came from two very different directions. In 1891 the young aesthete, Krust'o Krustev, fresh with a doctorate in philosophy from Leipzig, started a monthly named Kritika, the first Bulgarian journal devoted to literary values in Bulgaria. In his journal (renamed Misul in 1892) Krustev took it as his guiding principle that art must be judged on its aesthetic merits and by universal criteria and that "pure art," art for art's sake was of a higher order than art with a social purpose. At first tolerant of Vazov, he turned his scalpel on the great traditionalist with a vengeance, finding the literature Vazov produced and encouraged provincial, crude, naive.

In 1898 Krustev acquired in Pencho Slaveikov, Petko's prodigious son and a superb talent encased in a complex personality, a strong-willed ally in the jousting with the Vazov-Shishmanov camp. Pencho had just returned from six years in Germany where he studied philosophy and literature and nearly completed a doctoral dissertation at Leipzig on Heine and Russia. Unlike Krustev, he went to

Germany already affected by the strong paternal influence in the direction of democracy and appreciation of the popular poetic genius. Like Krustev, however, he became imbued with what he discovered in Germany, particularly Nietzsche, whose philosophy suited well the dominant traits of Pencho's personality. He returned to his native land appalled by its cultural backwardness and isolation from the West and "Europe" and turned into a tenacious advocate of modernism, Nietzschean individualism, "aristocracy of the spirit," and "Europeanism" in Bulgarian literature and cultural life. Vazov appeared to him the very antithesis of what Bulgaria needed in literature and values, and he virtually declared a literary war on the established master. The Krustev-Slaveikov challenge created for a number of years before Pencho's death in 1912 a polarity in Bulgarian literary life and provided an alternate ambience which attracted many of the young talents like Peio Lavorov, Petko Todorov, Kiril Khristov, Teodor Traianov, and others.

The second, much weaker challenge came from the nascent socialist movement and was also theoretical in its beginning. Dimitur Blagoev, expelled from Russia in 1885 for organizing the first Marxist group at the University of St. Petersburg, started sparring first with Zakhari Stoianov in 1886 over the question of the ideological heritage left by the "apostles" of the pre-liberation era who, Blagoev asserted, were not the mere nationalists Stoianov depicted them to be, but had advocated both national and social revolution. Blagoev's involvement in the literary scene as a critic pursuing political ends is mainly in the years from 1892 to 1905 when the affairs of the party, founded in 1891, did not yet claim all his time and energy. In the party journals Den (edited by Ianko Sakuzov) and Novo Vreme (edited by himself, 1897-1923) he declared an ideological war on the literary Establishment, above all Vazov, who in turn had no use for socialism and socialists and as minister of public education in 1897-1899 became identified with the repressive government of Konstantin Stoilov. Always the zealot in his chosen mission, Blagoev also declared war on Krustev, whose views that the artist should remain outside and above the issues of the day were even greater anathema than the ideology of the "literature of civic duty". The weakness of the socialist challenge was that it had no writer or poet of the artistic powers of Vazov or Pencho Slaveikov to command the attention they did and to translate the Marxist outlook into actual literature. The only adherent it had was a poet of modest talent, Dimitur Polianov, if one discounts Georgi Kirkov, who became noticed as a promising poet and feuilletonist before 1900 but later turned to party journalism. Most of the young faces on the literary stage -- Peio Iavorov, Kiril Khristov, Petko Todorov, Tsanko Tserkovski, and others -- were attracted by socialism at the outset of their careers but left it for other directions and outlooks. A factor for this "ebbing" of young talent from socialism, Marxist literary historians now concede, was Blagoev himself, a "born polemicist" determined to "decide the issues categorically" from a set of criteria narrowly and dogmatically conceived. As Pantelei Zarev puts it, "his weakness was his doctrinaire curtailment of contact with the Bulgarian writers," with the result that "no significant works appeared in the pages of Novo Vreme."[2]

Finally, the last decade of the nineteenth century witnessed the "discovery of the village" in the works of a number of young writers of populist outlook: Todor Vlaikov, Tsanko Tserkovski, Anton Strashimirov, Elin Pelin, and others. Unlike the traditional populists, they turned to the narod in the Russian sense of the word, to the peasant mass and village life with its mores, problems, and conflicts. Also unlike the traditional populists, these "neo-populists" stressed the difficult, seamy side in village life rather than its idyllic aspects and exhibited a strong reformist bent. The most prominent among them was Vlaikov, who as a student in Russia fell under the influence of N.K. Mikhailovskii and other Russian narodniki of the 1880's and 1890's and later mixed literature with politics as one of the founders and leaders of the Bulgarian Radical Party.

This cursory examination of the literary scene at the turn of the century provides, I believe, sufficient basis for the contention that, if one speaks of "twentieth century Bulgarian literature," the beginnings of such a segment are in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The 1890's saw the end of what had been an almost unilinear development since Paisii and the start of a rapid diversification under the impact of a changing society, widening contact with "Europe," dissemination of socialist ideas, and last but not least the blossoming of much new talent. At the outset of the decade Vazov dominated an underpopulated literary landscape as the continuator of the traditions of the national revival. By the decade's end Aleko Konstantinov, Pencho Slaveikov, Peio Iavorov, Todor Vlaikov, and many others had broken out in new directions in pursuit of other sets of values. Bulgarian literature had entered its twentieth century.

Development of the Field in Bulgaria

Let me now turn to the question of the resources developed in Bulgaria for the study of this segment of the nation's literature. It should be pointed out at the outset that the study of Bulgarian literature, medieval and modern, is undoubtedly the most fully developed field of scholarship in Bulgaria, sharing with linguistics and history the longest academic traditions and some of the best intellectual talents in the country. When the antecedent of the University of Sofia, the so-called Higher School, was established in 1888, its first division was a combined istoriko-filologicheski fakultet with a staff of seven instructors including Alexander Teodorov-Balan, Shishmanov, and Liubomir Miletich, who were to become the giants of the Bulgarian school of Slavic philology. In

---

[2] P. Zarev, Panorama na bulgarskata literatura, Vol. I, Part 1 (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1966), pp. 89-91; see also Zheliu Avdzhiev, Vliianieto na sotsialisticheskite idei vurkhu bulgarskata literatura do kraia na purvata svetovna voina (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1968), pp. 6-9 and 199-220.

1905 the university's Seminar on Slavic Philology, led by Miletich and later by Stoian Romanski, began publishing occasional Izvestiia na seminara po slavianska filologiia (9 vols. to 1948) with the very useful feature of current bibliographies of works on Bulgarian literature compiled by students in the seminar, Romanski, Kiril Mirchev, and Ivan Lekov among others. Although not exhaustive, these bibliographies cover well the years before and after 1900, in the latter case to 1942.[3] Works appearing in the first subseries (for the faculty of history and philology) of Godishnik na Sofiiskiia universitet and other university publications are listed in Asen Kovachev's Bibliografiia na Sofiiskiia universitet "Sv. Kliment Okhridski,"1904-1942 (1943), which has continuations by him, Katalog na universitetskite izdaniia, 1943-1946 (1947), and by Iuliiana Vasileva, Bibliografiia na izdaniiata na Sofiiskiia universitet, 1947-1955 (1956) and Bibliografiia na izdaniiata na Sofiiskiia universitet "Kliment Okhridski," 1956-1965 (1969), all issued by the university. The biobibliographies of the faculty's staff from 1888 to 1939 are in Almanakh na Sofiiskiia universitet Sv. Kliment Okhridski, zhivotopisni i knigopisni svedeniia za prepodavatelite (1940), which has a first, not entirely superseded edition published in 1929. The biobibliographies of the staff of the present Faculty of Slavic Philologies, reflecting the years 1940-1967, are in Biografski-bibliografski sbornik (1968), which the faculty issued for the Sixth International Congress of Slavists in Prague.[4] The first investigations of many of the faculty's graduates arising from seminar work have appeared and continue to appear in the university publications listed in the above bibliographies. Dissertations presented at the university and, since 1951, at other Bulgarian institutions are listed in L. Stanisheva and S. Shopova, Bibliografiia na disertatsiite zashtiteni v Bulgariia, 1929-1964.[5] The bibliography provides information as to the dissertation's director and examiners, resulting publication,[6] and reviews thereof. Dissertations presented since 1964 are listed in the national bibliography Bulgarski knigopis (currently biweekly)[7] and its Prilozhenie (quarterly).

A large body of works on Bulgarian literature has appeared in the publications of the country's other center of scholarship in this field, the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The contents of its publications are disclosed in the thoroughgoing Opis na izdaniiata na Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1869-1953 compiled by E. Savova and M. Stancheva;[8] they include a noteworthy "Bibliografiia na literaturnata istoriia i kritika u nas za vremeto ot 1900-1910 godina" by Khristo Gerchev.[9] The biobibliographies of the Academy's members active as writers, poets, critics, and historians of literature since its beginnings are in Vol I of Sto godini Bulgarska akademiia na naukite, 1869-1969 issued for the Academy's centennial under the editorship of Pantelei Zarev and others;[10] the second and third volume, reportedly in press, will provide the same information on the scholars constituting the research staff of the Academy. Also issued for the centennial was a catalog, 100 godini bulgarska akademichna kniga, 1869-1968,[11] reflecting works in this field in academy publications past 1953.

---

[3] Izvestiia's contents are listed in the university bibliographies discussed below. The National Library in Sofia also has a card index of some 8,000 entries for works on Bulgarian literary history and criticism published from 1878 to 1934. The index was compiled by Stefan PopVasilev; cf. Trenkov, Spetsialna bibliografiia (note 16 below), p. 191. On the university's history and publications, see M. Pundeff, "The University of Sofia at Eighty," Slavic Review, September, 1968, pp. 438-446.

[4] Published by Nauka i Izkustvo.

[5] Sofia: Universitetska biblioteka, 1969.

[6] Since 1960 it has been a requirement that at least the substance of the dissertation be published in article form before it is "defended" and "approved".

[7] [illegible] by the Cyril and Methodius National Library at Sofia.

Works of criticism and literary history that have appeared since 1944 are covered by T. Popiliev, Bulgarska khudozhestvena literatura i kritika; bibliografiia, Tom I. 1944-1954,[12] which has not been continued; S. Andreeva, Bibliografiia na slavianskoto literaturoznanie i folklor v Bulgariia za 1955-1956;[13] and two continuations under the same title for 1957-1960 and 1960-1965 compiled by Andreeva and L. Stanisheva.[14] Current information concerning books published in the field can be culled from Bulgarski knigopis; the same information, on a selective basis, concerning articles and reviews will be found in the biweekly Letopis na periodichniia pechat,[15] which scans the most important journals and newspapers in its function as the comprehensive current bibliography of the periodical literature. In addition to these two general bibliographies, current information is selectively provided by Referativnyi biulleten' bolgarskoi nauchnoi literatury. Iazykoznanie, literaturovedenie, iskusstvovedenie. A. Iazykoznanie i literaturovedenie, published since 1958 by the Central Library of the Academy of Sciences. This and other bibliographies appearing separately or in books and articles

---

[8] Sofia: BAN, 1956. This and other reference works of the academy issued since 1944 omit authors who became political nomina odiosa after 1944. For this reason the earlier bibliographies for 1870-1915 (1917) and 1870-1926 (1926) should also be consulted. On the academy's history and publications, see M. Pundeff, "The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences," East European Quarterly, September, 1969, pp. 371-386.

[9] Sbornik na Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite, Vol. XIV, 1921, pp. 1-101.

[10] Sofia: BAN, 1969. Also useful, especially for bibliographies of foreign members, is O. Raleva, Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite sled 9 septemvri 1944: spravochna kniga (Sofia: BAN, 1958).

[11] Sofia: BAN, 1969.

[12] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1957.

[13] Sofia: BAN, 1958.

[14] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1963, 1968. A current bibliography was initiated by Ezik i literatura in 1946, but was abandoned within a few months.

[15] Published since 1952 by the National Library.

are listed in the annual Bibliografiia na bulgarskata bibliografiia, knigoznanie i bibliotechno delo published since 1965 (covering 1963) by the National Library as continuation of the bibliography of Bulgarian bibliographies begun in 1945 in the now defunct Godishnik na Bulgarskiia bibliografski institut and carried there to 1962. Lastly, in the same area one should be aware of the relevant segments in Khristo Trenkov, Spetsialna bibliografiia,[16] which is a comprehensive survey of Bulgarian subject bibliographies as of the date of its publication; Boris Desev, Spravochno-bibliografski izdaniia,[17] which includes reference works of value to the field; and a report prepared in 1967 by Elena Savova, director of the academy's Central Library, and others on the problems of Bulgarian subject bibliography and scientific information and the lacunae in this area.[18]

Passing on to the bibliography of texts -- of the works of the Bulgarian writers and poets -- we find that while there is similarly no comprehensive retrospective or current bibliography, tools do exist which greatly facilitate the task of the researcher. The usual point of departure is the comprehensive biobibliographic guide Bulgarski pisateli; biografii, bibliografiia, compiled by Georgi Konstantinov and others.[19] It is an outgrowth of Konstantinov's earlier Bulgarski pisateli (1947) and Tvortsi na bulgarskata literatura (1941) and covers 420 writers, poets, critics, and literary historians for the period from 1850, when Vazov was born, to 1935 when three contemporary poets were born. In addition to a brief biography, the guide provides a bibliography of each author's works and a bibliography of works on him. Its shortcomings, however, are many (a number of authors - nomina odiosa and others - are omitted, data on publishers are not included, the bibliographies are quite incomplete)[20] and severely limit its utility. Similar biobibliographic information on a more limited scale is included in Kratka bulgarska entsiklopediia (5 vols.),[21] the one-volume Bulgarska entsiklopediia of Nikola and Ivan Danchov,[22] and Malka literaturna entsiklopediia compiled by Marko Marchevski.[23] Much of the same information is presented in the form of a chronology in Bulgarskata literatura v dati i kharakteristiki, 817-1965, compiled by Ivan Bogdanov.[24] Bogdanov is also the author of the valuable Rechnik na bulgarskite psevdonimi; pisateli, publitsisti, karikaturisti i ucheni,[25] which identifies the owners of the numerous pseudonyms used by Bulgarian authors. Another well-known literary historian and critic, Georgi Tsanev, has been at work as editor of a three-volume *Rechnik na bulgarskata literatura*, but although he indicated to me in May, 1970, that the first volume was about ready, it has not appeared yet.

---

[16] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1958.

[17] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1960.

[18] Published in Izvestiia na Tsentralnata biblioteka pri Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite, Vol. 4, 1968, pp. 11-93.

[19] Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1961.

[20] For these and other criticisms, see the review in Godishnik na Bulgarskiia bibliografski institut, Vol. VIII, 1962, pp. 149-154.

[21] Sofia: BAN, 1963-1969.

[22] Sofia: 1936.

[23] Sofia: 1940. A projected second edition in two volumes produced only the first volume (1946) devoted to foreign literature.

[24] Sofia: Narodna Prosveta, 1966.

[25] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1961.

Biobibliographic guides of less than general scope are quite numerous and include Tsenko Tsvetanov, ed., *Laureati na Dimitrovski nagradi za literatura za 1949, 1950 i 1951*,[26] providing information on forty-two authors who received the award; D. Chavdarov-Chelkash and A. Vulcheva, eds., *Khumor i satira v tvorchestvoto na bulgarskite pisateli*,[27] covering thirty-two authors; V. Aleksandrov and B. Znepolski, comps., *Za zhivota; pisateli zaginali v borbata protiv fashizma*,[28] which is also an anthology representing some twenty authors; Kamen Zidarov, comp., *Antologiia na bulgarskata poeziia*,[29] including about sixty poets; Petur Dinekov, comp., *Bulgarska lirika; antologiia*,[30] representing more than forty poets; and Georgi Konstantinov, *Bulgarski pisateli, tvortsi na literatura za detsa i iunoshi; biobibliografski ocherki*.[31] Such topical as well as individual author bibliographies, to repeat, are listed in the annual *Bibliografiia na bulgarskata bibliografiia* cited above.

Beginning with Vazov's *Under the Yoke* and *Under Oket*, translations of the works of Bulgarian authors, made abroad as well as in Bulgaria, have steadily grown in number. A comprehensive bibliography of these translations has been compiled by Veselin Traikov, *Bulgarska khudozhestvena literatura na chuzhdi ezitsi; bibliografski ukazatel, 1823-1962*,[32] identifying 5,463 titles in sixty-five languages. It was preceded by a shorter bibliography under the same title, identifying 644 titles published from 1944 to 1957.[33] Since the latter compilation is not incorporated into the former, both must be consulted; together they reflect well what was available in translation as of 1962. Traikov is also the sole or chief compiler of *Bulgariia v chuzhdata literatura, 1954-1963; bibliografski ukazatel*,[34] with a retrospective extension for 1944-1953[35] and annual additions beginning with 1964.[36] The compilation is intended to cover foreign writings on Bulgarian subjects, the so-called *Bulgarica*, and has rubrics for works on Bulgarian literature as well as translations. Traikov currently has charge of the annual *Bibliographie d'Etudes Balkaniques*, issued since 1968 (covering 1966) by the International Center for Scientific

---

26. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1953.
27. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1957.
28. Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1957.
29. Sofia: Smrikarov, 1949.
30. Sofia: Vestnik na zhenata, 1942.
31. Sofia: Narodna mladezh, 1958.
32. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1964.
33. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1958.
34. Published by the National Library in 1965.
35. Ditto, 1968.
36. Ditto, 1966 --.

Research and Documentation of the academy's Institute of Balkan Studies on behalf of the International Association of Southeast European Studies.[37] Its rubric for Bulgarian literature is understandably small, given its scope, but the researcher will find it valuable as the only systematic attempt to cover writings in Turkish, Greek, Albanian, Rumanian, and other languages usually outside the ken of Slavists.

In the realm of comparative literature and foreign influences, the researcher will again be vexed by the absence of a comprehensive bibliography. The dimensions and importance of this area of study are suggested by the bibliographic review of V. Velchev and S. Rusakiev, "Izuchavane na rusko-bulgarskite i suvetsko-bulgarskite literaturni vruzki za petnadeset godini,"[38] and Stefan I.Knuchev and Traian S. Radev, *Bulgaro-nemski kulturni otnosheniia, 1806-1966; bibliografiia.*[39]

For identification of texts the researcher must generally rely on the general tools of Bulgarian bibliography. Books published before 1905 are readily identifiable through Balan's massive *Bulgarski knigopis za sto godini, 1806-1905.*[40] Books published after 1905 can be searched out with the aid of *Bulgarski knigopis*, the current national bibliography, which was legislated into existence in 1897 under the provisions of the law on book deposit introduced by the writer Konstantin Velichkov, then minister of public education. There are, however, considerable gaps in both Balan[41] and *Bulgarski knigopis* for the years before 1944.[42] An effort is under way at the National Library to remedy this problem by compiling an exhaustive bibliography of Bulgarian imprints for 1878-1944.[43] The compilation will list approximately 80,000 titles (publications of more than eight pages and *tirage* of at least 100 copies), or 15,000 more than Balan and *Bulgarski knigopis* show for the period. The first of the planned nine volumes of the bibliography is reportedly in press. In searching out texts published in periodicals the researcher must turn to Dimitur P. Ivanchev, compl., *Bulgarski periodichen pechat, 1844-1944* (3 vols.),[44] which is a well-annotated list of the Bulgarian periodicals published since Konstantin Fotinov's monthly *Liuboslovie* (with the ingenious title coined as equivalent of "philology") first appeared in Smyrna. The annotations include data on the number of issues published, the editors and principal contributors, indexes to the periodical's contents, etc. The third volume, which contains indexes to the first two, has a very useful index of names identifying a large number of obscure and minor literati as to their place of birth and dates of birth and death. A similar bibliography for 1944-1964 is in preparation at the National Library. Annual listing of the entire periodical press (newspapers, journals, serials) is provided since 1967 (covering 1965) by *Bulgarski periodichen pechat*, a publication of the National Library; its first issue indicates the tools available for identifying periodicals published during the 1944-1964 period.[45]

---

[37] Sofia: Academie bulgare des sciences, 1968-1970; 3 vols. to date.

[38] *Godishnik na Sofiiskiia universitet, filologicheski fakultet*, Vol. LIV, 1959-1960, Kniga 2, pp. 85-131.

[39] Sofia: Narodna Biblioteka "Kiril i Metodii," 1968.

[40] Sofia: BAN, 1909.

[41] Some of the gaps in Balan have been pointed out by Nikola Nachov in *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniia i narodopis*, Vol. XXVI (1910), and *Sbornik na Bulgarskata akademiia na naukite*, Vols. III (1914) and XVII (1925)

[42] On *Bulgarski knigopis* and its gaps, see Tsenko Tsvetanov, *Bulgarska bibliografiia; istoricheski pregled i dneshno sustoianie* (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1957), pp. 68-72.

3. The bibliography is obviously intended to extend Man'o Stoianov, *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska knizhnina; analitichen repertoar na bulgarskite knigi i periodichni izdaniia, 1806-1878*(Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1957-1959; 2 vols.).

[44] Sofia:Nauka i Izkustvo, 1962-1969.

Finally in regard to materials originating in Bulgaria, the researcher faces the problem of identification and access to the unpublished papers, correspondence, etc., of Bulgarian literati. Since 1951, when a systematic approach to the preservation of archives was first taken, such materials are normally deposited in the "Tsentralen durzhaven istoricheski arkhiv," currently under the jurisdiction of the Committee for Art and Culture. Its holdings are described in detail in *Putevoditel na Tsentralniia durzhaven istoricheski arkhiv*, compiled by Nadezhda Burzakova and others.[46] Despite the efforts at centralization, a great deal of relevant material is also held in the National Library's "Bulgarski istoricheski arkhiv," described in *Obzor na arkhivnite fondove, kolektsii i edinichni postupleniia sukhraniavani v Bulgarski istoricheski arkhiv* (3vols. to date),[47] and in the Academy's "Nauchen arkhiv," which houses papers of academy members. The history and present organization of archives in the country are fully explained by Mariia Kuzmanova, *Istoriia na arkhivite i organizatsiia na arkhivnoto delo v Bulgariia*,[48] and N. Pelovska and others, eds., *Deset godini tsentralizirano arkhivno delo v Narodna Republika Bulgariia*,[49] which has an extensive bibliography. Archival materials as well as surveys and notes on holdings appear frequently in *Izvestiia na durzhavnite arkhivi*; *Izvestiia* of the Academy's Central Library, which currently has charge of "Nauchen arkhiv;" *Izvestiia na nauchniia arkhiv*; *Literaturen arkhiv* and *Izvestiia* of the Academy's Institute of Literature; and *Izvestiia* of the National Library (currently published together with the University Library).[50]

---

[45] It may be noted that the appearance and discontinuance of periodicals in this period was indicated in *Bulgarski knigopis*.

[46] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1970.

[47] Sofia: Nauka i Izhustvo, 1963-1970.

[48] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1966.

[49] Sofia: Ministerstvo na vutreshnite raboti, Arkhiven otdel, 1961.

[50] This information is amplified in *Nauchni uchrezhdeniia v Bulgariia, 1966; spravochnik* (Sofia: BAN, 1967), *Les Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-Est Europeennes en Bulgarie; Guide de Documentation* (Sofia: BAN, 1966), and *Spravochnik na bibliotekite v Bulgariia*, compiled by Snezhina Tosheva and others (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1963), all of which the researcher [illegible] Bulgarian libraries and institutions is well advised

This section on materials of Bulgarian provenance may be concluded with some of the general histories and surveys of Bulgarian literature which cover developments in the twentieth century and can serve the purposes of initial orientation and introduction. The four-volume Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura,[51] which is being published by the Academy's Institute of Literature and represents a consensus Marxist interpretation, is now in its third volume dealing with the 1878-1918 period. Zarev's Panorama na bulgarskata literatura,[52] planned in four volumes as a work of critical evaluation rather than a conventional history, has penetrated the 1920's with the two parts of volume I available so far. Tsanev's Stranitsi ot istoriiata na bulgarskata literatura[53] has reached volume II of the three planned and "the watershed of two centuries," that is , the decades of 1890-1910. Among the earlier, non-Marxist, and generally unsatisfactory treatments one may resort to Malcho Nikolov, Istoriia na bulgarskata literatura ot Petka Slaveikov do vtorata svetovna voina,[54] and Nikolai Donchev, Esquisse d'un tableau de la nouvelle litterature bulgare.[55]

Development of the Field in Other Countries

When one turns to the work done on twentieth century Bulgarian literature outside Bulgaria, the contributions made in Russia before and since the revolution in historical and analytical studies, translations, and bibliographies stand out by sheer quantity. For a time, from 1917 to the early 1930's, the process of accumulation that had started in the beginning of the nineteenth century was severely disrupted by the revolution and its aftermath, resulting in an intense hostility to slavianovedenie as one of the noxious preoccupations of the "bourgeois" scholars and in its "de facto liquidation."[56] A gradual return to slavianovedenie, stimulated among other factors by the need to build a coalition of the Slavic nations against Germany before and during World War II, led in January, 1947, to the establishment of a special Institute of Slavic Studies in the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to serve as the principal Soviet agency for the execution, promotion, and coordination of studies, in the USSR and abroad in the Slavic countries, dealing with Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish, and Yugoslav history, literature, and linguistics. In the twenty-five years of its existence the Institute, which now has also jurisdiction over Balkan studies

---

[51] See note 1 above.

[52] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1966; 2nd ed., 1969 --.

[53] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1967 --; 4th ed.

[54] Sofia: Progres, 1947; 3rd ed. For other histories, see M. Pundeff, Bulgaria: A Bibliographic Guide (Washington: Library of Congress, 1965; reprint by Arno Press, 1968), pp. 22-23.

[55] Sofia: 1935.

[56] S. A. Nikitin, "Zadachi sovetskikh istorikov v oblasti izucheniia istorii Iugoslavii, "Slavianskii sbornik (Voronezh, 1958), pp. 7-12.

(*balkanistika*), has become the central institution for the study of Bulgarian literature in the USSR, towering over other units in the universities of the Russian SFSR, the academy and universities of the Ukrainian SSR, and similar institutions in other union republics (Belorussian, Moldavian, Armenian, Georgian) where work on Bulgarian literature occasionally takes place. In its many functions the Institute produces works prepared by its own staff, sponsors works by scholars residing outside Moscow, and serves as a degree-granting institution where *kandidat* and *doktor* dissertations are prepared and defended.[57]

The work done in the Russian language since the revolution is conveniently shown in the comprehensive bibliography of I. A. Kaloeva, *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie; literatura o zarubezhnykh slavianskikh stranakh na russkom iazyke,1918-1960* and its extension for 1961-1962.[58] Under Bulgarian literature it lists some 300 entries representing general surveys, monographs, articles, dissertations, translations, and bibliographies, the most noteworthy of the latter being A. D. Umikian and V. E. Shor, *Bolgarskaia literatura; bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*.[59] Work published after 1962 is reflected in the monthly bibliography, *Novaia literatura po Bolgarii*, published by the Fundamental Library of Social Sciences in Moscow, and, since 1965, in the bimonthly journal *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie*,published by the Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies. In regard to work in other languages of the USSR since the revolution, there is unfortunately no bibliography similar to Kaloeva's, and the researcher must fall back on the general tools for Soviet bibliographic research. The importance of this work, especially in Ukrainian, must not be underestimated. Existing bibliographies of prerevolutionary work in Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, and other languages of the empire are discussed in a thorough-going article by A. N. Goriainov, "K istorii slavianovedcheskoi bibliografii; obzor russkikh i sovetskikh bibliograficheskikh ukazatelei o zapadnykh i iuzhnykh slavianakh."[60] Among the tools published since World War II, two joint Soviet-Bulgarian bibliographies require special attention: *Istoriia Bolgarii do 9 sentiabria 1944; ukazatel' literatury, 1945-1958*,[61] the second volume of which is devoted to literature, art, and scholarship; and Narodnaia Respublika Bolgariia; istoricheskaia bibliografiia,[62] which lists Bulgarian and Soviet publications from 1944 to 1954, with substantial sections covering literature in the postwar years.

---

[57] For further details on the evolution of Soviet *slavianovedenie* and the performance of the Institute, see V.D. Koroliuk and others, *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie; kratkii obzor literatury, 1945-1963* (Moscow: ANSSSR, 1963); M. Pundeff, "Sowjetische Forschungsarbeiten zur neuzeitlichen Balkan-Geshichte," *Saeculum*, No. 3, 1964, pp. 276-283; and V. I. Zlydnev, "Izuchenie zarubezhnykh slavianskikh literatur v Sovetskom soiuze (1917-1967 gg.)," *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie*, No. 5, 1967, pp. 53-66.

[58] Moscow: ANSSSR, 1963.

[59] Leningrad: Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka imeni Saltykova-Shchedrina, 1948.

[60] *Izvestiia* of the National Library and the University Library, Vol. III (IX), 1963, pp. 370-426.

[61] Moscow: ANSSSR, 1962-1963; 2 vols.

In regard to general treatments of Soviet provenance, the most important is Ocherki istorii bolgarskoi literatury XIX-XX vekov,[63] prepared under the sponsorship of the Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies by a number of Soviet specialists in Bulgarian literature. The volume is intended to provide a Marxist history of Bulgarian literature from the 1850's to the 1950's and deals at length (in 330 pages out of 504) with twentieth century developments. An extensive bibliography of Bulgarian and Soviet publications, including texts and Russian translations, is appended.

The closest match to the long Russian interest in Bulgarian literature are the developments in the German-speaking area, and then only if one takes the area to include the Slavic lands of the former Austro-Hungarian empire. Primarily because of the interest of Czech scholars, the centers in the Habsburg empire led until 1918, but after World War I and the empire's break-up, leadership passed to the universities and institutions in Germany, above all those at Leipzig, Breslau, Berlin, and Munich. World War II and its aftermath set back the work at East and West German centers and the academic centers of Austria, but in recent years scholars have emerged, especially in West Germany, to make significant contributions to the study of Bulgarian literature.

Publications in German dealing with Bulgarian literature lack a comprehensive bibliography, but a number of tools exist which reflect most of them or serve to orient German-speaking students in the subject. Of the latter variety, the most comprehensive is the guide by Peter Gerlinghoff, Bibliographische Einführung in das Studium der neueren bulgarischen Literatur (1850-1950),[64] which has some 1,700 entries listing, in a first part, bibliographies, journals, general surveys, and works dealing with more than one author, and , in a second part, works by and on fifty-seven major writers from Petko Slaveikov to Dimitur Dimov. Publications of both Bulgarian and foreign provenance are included. Another guide of broader scope and less value to the student of Bulgarian literature si A. Hille, Bibliographische Einführung in das Studium der slawischen Philologie.[65] Reports on Bulgarian publications, with inclusion of foreign works in some cases, have been provided by Stefan PopVasilev, "Die bulgarische Literaturgeschichte und Literaturkritik in den

---

[62] Moscow: ANSSSR, 1954-1958; 2 vols. The first volume covers developments of 1944-1947, the second those of 1948-1952; a third is reportedly in preparation for the period 1953-1958.

[63] Moscow: ANSSSR, 1959.

[64] Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1969.

[65] Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1959.

Jahren 1914-1929;"[66] Emil Georgiev, "Die bulgarische Literaturwissenschaft in den Jahren 1930-1939;" [67] "Bulgarskoto literaturoznanie v godinite 1940-1947," also by him;[68] and the five-year bibliographic surveys in *Südosteuropa-Bibliographie*, published by the Südost-Institut in Munich and covering so far 1945-1960.[69] The work published in German-language periodicals to 1963 is listed in Klaus-Dieter Seemann and Frank Siegmann, *Bibliographie der slavistischen Arbeiten aus den deutschsprachigen Fachzeitschriften, 1876-1963.*[70] A few titles will be found in *Materialien zu einer slawistischen Bibliographie; Arbeiten der in Österreich, der Schweiz und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland tätigen Slawisten (1945-1963)*, compiled by Irmgard Mahnken and Karl-Heinz Pollok.[71] The work done in East Germany is reflected in Heinz Pohrt, *Bibliographie slawistischer Publikationen aus der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1946-1967.*[72] Dissertations, for the most part unpublished, are listed in *Südosteuropa-Dissertationen, 1918-1960; eine Bibliographie deutscher, österreichischer und schweizerischer Hochschulschriften*, compiled by Anton Scherer.[73]

Extensive though it is, the work in German does not include a synthesis of the history of Bulgarian literature beyond summarizing sections in handbooks and articles in encyclopedias. The most recent coverage is provided in the encyclopedic volume *Bulgarien*, prepared by Christo Ognjanoff for the "Bibliothek Kultur der Nationen."[74] Himself a poet and journalist, Ognjanoff devotes over one hundred pages to the literature since Vazov. Of interest mainly for the bibliography prepared by Alexander Adamczyk is *Die slavischen Völker*, a synthesizing work by Paul Diels.[75] Articles on general developments and characterizations of individual Bulgarian authors are included in *Lexikon der Weltliteratur im 20. Jahrhundert*, *Lexikon der Weltliteratur*, *Die Weltliteratur*, and *Kindlers Literaturlexikon.*

As indicated above, Czech and Polish interest in Bulgarian literature dates back to the period before World War I when the Czech and Polish lands were part of the Austro Hungarian and Russian empires. In the period since their independence this interest has continued to produce a body of work which demands the attention

---

66. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* (Leipzig-Heidelberg), Vol. VIII (1931), pp. 443-463; Vol. IX (1932), pp. 165-195 and 426-452; and Vol. X (1933), pp. 171-194.
67. *Ibid.*, Vol. XVII (1941), pp. 168-179 and 420-430; Vol. XVIII (1942), pp. 194-210 and 418-434; and Vol. XIX (1947), pp. 129-143.
68. *Slavia* (Prague), Vol. XIX (1947), pp. 213-226. This survey is included here for the continuation of coverage it provides.
69. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1956 --.
70. Berlin, 1965; sold by Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
71. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1963.
72. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
73. Graz, Vienna, Cologne: Böhlau, 1968.
74. Nurnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1968.
75. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963.

of the student of Bulgarian literature. While the work in Czechoslovakia lacks a convenient bibliography, the student will find a great deal of data in Zdenek Urban, Z dejin cesko-bulharskych kulturnich styku,[76] and Danushe Khronkova, "Po niakoi vuprosi na bulgarskata literatura v Chekhiia mezhdu dvete svetovni voini."[77] The partial bibliography available for Polish work, Bulgaria w pismiennictwie polskim (1944-1963), compiled by Wanda Szolginiowa,[78] is a good index of what the researcher can expect to find. It is in recognition of the importance of Czech and Polish contributions to Slavic studies that the first two international congresses of Slavists were held in Prague (1929) and Warsaw (1934).[79]

Beyond the Slavic and German lands, the work in Italy is well covered in Petur Iordanov, La Bulgaria in Italia; bibliografia delle pubblicazioni italiane sulla Bulgaria, 1870-1942;[80] Enrico Damiani, Avviamento agli studi slavistici in Italia;[81] and Arturo Cronia, La conoscenza del mondo slavo in Italia; bilancio storico-bibliografico di un millennio.[82] The Italian journal, Ricerche slavistiche (1952-), publishes occasionally bibliographic articles dealing with Bulgarian literature. The most recent summation in Italian is the chapter on Bulgarian literature in the sixth volume of Storia delle letterature moderne d'Europa e d'America,[83] contributed by Damiani, who produced also earlier general treatments of the subject.

In France, interest in modern Bulgarian literature dates essentially from the establishment of the Institut d'Etudes Slaves at the Sorbonne in 1921 and the initiation of its journal Revue des Etudes Slaves (1921-) under the directorship of Andre Mazon.[84] French work is reflected in the bibliographie raisonnee maintained in each annual volume of the journal and including publications of Bulgarian and other origin. French dissertations, which include the best work on Vazov published outside Bulgaria,[85] are listed in

---

[76] Prague: Ceskoslovenska akademia ved, 1957.

[77] In Chekhoslovakiia i Bulgariia prez vekovete, edited by Khristo Gandev and others (Sofia: BAN, 1963), pp. 415-456.

[78] Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 1965. The Bulgarian press (Rabotnichesko Delo, August 15, 1971) has reported the publication of a collection of Studies in Poland entitled "Polish-Bulgarian Literary Ties." I have not been able to examine the volume.

[79] The contributions to these and the subsequent congresses in Belgrade (3rd, 1955), Moscow (4th, 1958), Sofia (5th, 1963), and Prague (6th, 1968) include papers dealing with modern Bulgarian literature.

[80] Rome: 1943.

[81] Milan: Mondadori, 1941.

[82] Padua: 1958; published by the Istituto di Studi Adriatici in Venice.

[83] Edited by Carlo Pellegrini; Milan: Vallardi, 1958-1960.

[84] On Mazon and other Bulgarianists, see Stefan PopVasilev, Priiateli na Bulgariia; sreshti i razgovori s chuzhdestranni slavisti (Sofia: Bulgarski Pisatel, 1963).

[85] Petr Christophorov, Ivan Vazov: la formation d'un ecrivain [illegible] Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1938; No. XVII

M. Seydoux and M. Biesiekierski, Repertoire des theses concernant les etudes slaves, l'U.R.S.S. et les pays de l'Est europeen, et soutenues en France de 1824 a 1969.[86] The best general treatment in French continues to be Panorama de la litterature bulgare contemporaine, by Georges Hateau,[87] the longtime director of "Alliance Francaise" in Sofia.

As in France, the study of modern Bulgarian literature in the English-speaking countries is largely a development of the period since World War I. This fact is well attested by Slavic Europe; a selected bibliography in the western European languages comprising history, languages, and literatures, compiled by Robert J. Kerner in 1918.[88] England, closest to Bulgaria and evidencing interest with the translation of Vazov's Pod Igoto in 1894, led the way with the establishment of the now quarterly journal Slavonic and East European Review (1922-) by the School of Slavonic Studies at the University of London. The journal has provided space not only for studies of Bulgarian literature but for translations as well. A product of this school and currently professor in it is Vivian de Sola Pinto, known for his work on Vlaikov and the narodnichestvo at the turn of the century aa well as for the teaching aid Bulgarian Prose and Verse: A Selection with An Introductory Essay.[89]

On this side of the Atlantic, American interest in modern Bulgarian literature during the interwar period was essentially limited to a course of wider scope which Professor Clarence A. Manning began to teach at Columbia University in 1929. As part of his efforts Dimitur Shishmanov, son of Professor Shishmanov and a writer of considerable stature, published A Survey of Bulgarian Literature, prepared as a lecture at the university and translated by Manning.[90] American interest in things Bulgarian was also promoted by the Protestant missionaries in Bulgaria. From this setting came the book of the Balkan correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor, Reuben H. Markham, Meet Bulgaria,[91] in which he perceptively discussed trends and principal representatives of Bulgarian literature. The paucity of work during the interwar period, however, is evident when one turns to the surveys of Clarence Manning in Leonid I. Strakhovsky, ed., A Handbook of Slavic Studies[92] and his own A History of Slavic Studies in the United States.[93]

---

[86] Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1970; No. XXX of its Travaux.

[87] Paris: Editions du Sagittaire, 1937.

[88] Harvard University Press.

[89] London: Athlone Press, 1957.

[90] Williamsport, Pa.: The Bayard Press, 1932; based on Shishmanov's Le mouvement litteraire en Bulgarie (Sofia, 1925).

[91] Sofia: The Author, 1931.

[92] Harvard University Press, 1949; see Manning's chapter "The Literature of the Balkan Slavs" and its bibliography.

[93] Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1957.

As it has been generally recognized, World War II and its aftermath intensified American interest in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to the point that a quarter of a century since the end of the war American scholarship is in a leading position so far as the general field of Slavic and Eastern European studies in the West is concerned. One of the first manifestations of intensified interest was the establishment of a quarterly journal, The American Slavic and East European Review (now The Slavic Review), in 1941 to serve as an outlet as well as stimulant of scholarship in this field. Understandably, Russian and Soviet studies took most of the attention and resources, but in 1949 a certain balance began to develop due to the efforts of the Free Europe Committee, which was formed to support political and intellectual dissenters from Eastern Europe and operate Radio Free Europe. Results of the systematic research conducted under its auspices appeared from 1952 to 1970 in the committee's monthly journal News From Behind the Iron Curtain (renamed East Europe in 1956),[94] which devoted space also to articles and documents dealing with the current literary scene in Bulgaria. Publications sponsored by the committee included a series of country handbooks under the general editorship of Robert F. Byrnes; the volume Bulgaria, edited by L. A. D. Dellin,[95] included in its chapter on "Literature and the Arts" a brief discussion of twentieth century Bulgarian literature to the mid-1950's. Byrnes was also the compiler of Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957,[96] which complements for the first postwar decade the current annual American Bibliography of Russian and East European Studies.[97] An essential tool, the American Bibliography unfortunately suffers from a time lag of several years between the year covered and the year it is published.[98]

At American academic centers, the study of modern Bulgarian literature continued to be represented at Columbia by Manning, who published with Roman Smal-Stocki The History of Modern Bulgarian Literature,[99] an unpretentious survey which includes translations of Bulgarian poetry and a selected bibliography. At Harvard Albert

---

[94] The journal appeared from 1952 to 1970. Currently a monthly journal under the same title and in the same format continues to cover area developments but disclaims connection with the earlier East Europe. Radio Free Europe also publishes at its Munich headquarters "situation reports" which occasionally deal with the literary scene and are available on subscription. Based primarily on RFE research is J.F. Brown's Bulgaria Under Communist Rule (New York: Praeger,1970), which includes in its chapter on "Frost and Thaw in Bulgarian Culture" a review of literary developments from 1953 to 1968.

[95] New York: Praeger, 1957.

[96] Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1958.

[97] Bloomington: Indiana University Publication, 1956-.

[98] In 1968 it was announced that beginning with the volume for 1967, the bibliography will be published by Ohio State University Press, but so far no volumes following that for 1965 have appeared.

[99] New York: Bookman Associates, 1960.

B. Lord has dealt with the subject in a course introduced in 1951 and has aided its teaching with two publications.[100] At first at Yale and now at George Washington University Charles A. Moser has included modern Bulgarian literature in the scope of his interests and has completed, in addition to several published articles, a book-length survey of it. The subject is also represented, at least in terms of faculty interest and research, at a number of other American and Canadian universities and colleges. Evidence of such interest and research is encountered, beyond the pages of the Slavic Review and the meetings of the parent American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies and its regional affiliates, in the meetings and publications of the Modern Language Association of America, including its annual International Bibliography, the Slavic and East European Journal (1957-) published by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, and the Canadian Slavic Studies (1967-) which publishes bibliographic supplements.

In regard to American translations of Bulgarian literary works, a number of them are listed in the second volume of The Literatures of the World in English Translation: A Bibliography.[101] Annual information is supplied by UNESCO's Index Translationum: International Bibliography of Translations which, it might be noted, lists its entries according to the country in which the translation appeared and also suffers from a time lag between the year covered (the latest volume covers 1969) and the year the Index appears. A guide to selected translations has been compiled by Assen Nicoloff, Bulgarian Folklore and Fine Literature Translated into English, French, and German: A Selected Biobibliography.[102] A collection of thirty-six short stories compiled by Nikolai Kirilov and Frank Kirk, Introduction to Modern Bulgarian Literature: An Anthology of Short Stories,[103] may be singled out as a convenient representation of the genre in Bulgaria.

The waning of support of Eastern European studies by the Free Europe Committee and the continued preoccupation with Russian and Soviet studies threatened by the early 1960's to create a severe imbalance in American academic coverage of these areas. In 1964 the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council came to a decision that a comprehensive survey should be undertaken "to examine the state of American scholarship" on Eastern Europe and make plans for "the stimulation and development of such studies."[104] The results of the survey conducted by the Sub-committee on East Central and Southeast European Studies of the Joint Committee are the well-known three volumes published by University of Chicago Press in 1969, the first of which, Language and Area Studies: East Central and Southeastern Europe; A Survey (edited by Charles Jelavich, the Sub-committee's chairman) examined the state of the art and teaching programs in fifteen disciplines, including literature, while the other two, East Central Europe: A Guide to Basic Publications and Southeastern Europe: A Guide to Basic Publications (edited by Paul L. Horecky), reflected bibliographically what had been accomplished and what needed to be done.[105] The chapter on "Literature" in the Jelavich Survey, prepared by William E. Harkins of Columbia, notes in regard to Bulgarian literature some of the existing works in Western languages (erroneously referring to the 1912 edition of Vazov's Under the Yoke as its first English translation) and states flatly that "the whole field is a gap." The section on Bulgarian literature in the Horecky Guide, prepared by James F. Clarke, contains, apparently because of limitations of space, only a few entries relevant to modern or twentieth century developments and is hardly more than suggestive of the subject and the publications available for its study; it also erroneously lists the first volume of Tsanev's Rechnik as having appeared in 1966. Under a recent decision of the American Council of Learned Societies, the survey of the state of the art and the two bibliographic guides will be supplemented by a survey, under the direction of Horecky, of the holdings of American libraries in publications from and about Eastern Europe. It is perhaps in recognition of the recommendations formulated in the Jelavich Survey that the U.S. Office of Education has provided the support necessary to hold the present conference.

---

[100] Beginning Bulgarian (The Hague: Mouton, 1962) and, with David E. Bynum, A Bulgarian Literary Reader (The Hague: Mouton, 1968).

[101] New York: Frederick Ungar, 1967; compiled by Richard C. Lewanski.

[102] Cleveland: The Author, 1971; mimeographed.

[103] New York: Twayne, 1969.

[104] Charles Jelavich, "East Central and Southeast European Studies," ACLS Newsletter, November, 1968, pp. 1-11.

In the area of library acquisitions, through the efforts of the Joint Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies and other groups the Ford Foundation has made a grant of $350,000 to the Association of Research Libraries to establish and administer a Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center at the Association's headquarters in Washington, D.C. The Center, which began operation on October 1, 1969, under the directorship of E. Alex Baer, has the purpose of eliminating some of the existing bibliographic lacunae and being of assistance to the growing number of university and college libraries developing Slavic collections, but frequently lacking qualified staff. In May, 1970, the Center initiated a monthly list, New Slavic Publications,[106] as a guide in the selection and acquisition of current publications from the five Slavic countries in the social sciences and humanities. The titles, with a heavy representation of literature, are selected by consultants from pre-publication catalogs (in the Bulgarian case, from the monthly Bulgarski knigi), so that orders can be placed as early as possible with reasonable assurance of getting the desired items.

---

[105] All three volumes were prepared and published under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education

[106] Available on subscription from the Center, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. The Center also publishes occasionally a Newsletter, which provides a wealth of bibliographic and other information of value to Slavists, and an annual list of current dissertations, Dissertations-in-Progress in Slavic and East European Studies, reflecting work at American, Canadian, West German, and Austrian universities.

Finally in regard to recent developments in the U. S., at the last meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in Denver (March 25-27, 1971) a number of Bulgarianists met at breakfast to discuss ways and means of promoting Bulgarian studies in the United States. The participants in the discussion agreed to regard themselves as the nucleus of a Bulgarian Studies Group which is to be open to all who have a professional interest in Bulgaria and is to operate informally within the AAASS. The Group will publish a newsletter and possibly a godishnik or sbornik for scholarly studies from the various disciplines, including literature. The newletter is in the hands of Thomas A. Meininger[107] who will send it upon request to anyone interested in receiving it or joining the Group.

Availability of Publications in Western Libraries

To begin with American libraries, the richest collection of publications from and on Bulgaria is at the Library of Congress. In regard to twentieth century Bulgarian literature, nearly all of the publications discussed above are in it. Built on a large scale through purchase, exchange, and cooperation with Bulgarian institutions going back to the beginning of this century, the collection contains the works of the vast majority of Bulgarian writers as well as those of the historians of literature and critics. At present the Library's acquisition of current publications is based on the so-called Shared Cataloging Program whereby the Bulgarian National Library supplies the bulk of the publications listed in Bulgarski knigopis.[108] Information on the current acquisitions of the Library of Congress is available not only through its printed catalogs, but through its service of supplying printed cards on subscription.

Beyond the Library of Congress which, as the de facto American national library, collects in almost all fields, the strongest collection on Bulgarian literature is at the Harvard University Library, which has the responsibility, under the Farmington Plan for the specialization of major American libraries, to collect a copy of every publication having to do with this field.[109] According to a recent announcement, the Harvard Bulgarian collection is now reflected in a printed shelflist published by the Harvard University Library. Catalogs published by G. K. Hall, Boston, reflect the substantial collections at the New York Public Library (as of 1959) and the University of California at Berkeley and Los Angeles (as of 1962). The University Research Library of UCLA has in recent years amassed a major Bulgarian collection containing, in regard to Bulgarian literature, mostly works published or republished since World War II. Other substantial collections exist at Yale, Chicago, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. The current acquisitions of these and other American libraries are reflected in the National Union Catalog. There is, unfortunately, no complete union catalog as yet to show all of the acquisitions; the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints has reached with Vol. 164 only to "Ey".

---

[107] At present with the Department of History, York University, Toronto, Canada.

[108] John G. Lorenz (Deputy Librarian of Congress), "The Exchange of Official Publications between the United States and Eastern Europe," paper dated September 1, 1970.

[109] Edwin E. Williams, Farmington Plan Handbook (1961 ed.), p. 46.

In England, extensive collections exist in London, at the British Museum and the library of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, which together hold the publications necessary for a sophisticated study of the subject. In France, the best collections are also in the capital, at the Bibliotheque Nationale and the libraries of Ecole Naticnale des Langues Orientales Vivantes (now Institut National des Langues et Civilizations Orientales) and the Institut d'Etudes Slaves. Especially good is the collection at the Institut which has had a steady flow of Bulgarian publications since the 1920's. In West Germany, the largest collections are in Munich, an old center of Southeast European studies, where the accumulation of Bulgarian publications at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and the Südost-Instut has gone on systematically for decades. The extensive holdings of the libraries of the old capital are scattered: parts of the library of the University of Berlin are at the Free University, which also has a well-developed library of the Osteuropa-Institut; parts of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek are at the library of the Herder-Institut in Marburg, whose catalog has also been printed by G. K. Hall. In Austria, the principal collections are at the Slavic institutes of the universities of Vienna and Graz; the Institut für osteuropäische Geschichte und Südostforschung der Universität Wien has a few older and valuable titles, mainly from the library of C. Jirecek. My familiarity with libraries in Italy is too narrow (involving mainly the specialized library of the Istituto Pontificio in Rome) to allow me to make a general comment on what the student of modern Bulgarian literature can expect to find there.

Desiderata of American Scholarship

A survey of the resources available for the study of twentieth century Bulgarian literature creates the temptation to offer some ideas concerning the needs of the field in terms of English-language publications. The recommendations formulated by Professor Harkins in the Jelavich Survey envisaged three publications: a history of Bulgarian literature, a two-volume bilingual anthology of poetry and prose, and a vademecum providing data in a variety of fields according to a detailed outline. The history, written by Professor Moser, is forthcoming, and one can hardly quarrel with the desirability of the kind of anthology Professor Harkins proposed. The vade-mecum, however, would meet the needs for general information much better if it were conceived as a substantial one-volume "Encyclopedia of Bulgaria." The preparation of such an encyclopedic tool, furthermore, should be the task not only of scholars in the field of literature, but experts from the entire spectrum of the social sciences and humanities. The task can be entrusted to the Bulgarian Studies Group within the AAASS, which should set up an editorial board for the purpose and poll its membership on the questions of coverage and contributors. What seems to me is the preeminent task of the experts in literature is the compilation of a "Biobibliographic Guide to Bulgarian Literature," on the order of Albert Tezla's *Hungarian Authors: A Bibliographical Handbook*, to serve the graduate student and the general user in the identification of Bulgarian authors, their works, translations thereof, and works on them. For speedier execution the guide should be a collective undertaking of scholars in the United States and abroad directed by an editorial board which the present conference may well develop. A less ambitious undertaking, which may serve as the initial step toward the production of the "Biobibliographic Guide," is the compilation of a exhaustive list of bibliographies of Bulgarian literature.

Present and future research will also be well served if the holdings of American libraries, especially in Bulgarian periodicals, are fully disclosed in retrospective union catalogs. Such compilations would go beyond the field of literature, but their desirability may be established by the present conference with a recommendation to the Bulgarian Studies Group to address itself to that task as well. A union catalog of Bulgarian periodicals would be relatively easy to execute by compiling a list from *Bulgarski periodichen pechat, 1844-1944* and the bibliographies of periodicals published since 1944 and requesting the libraries acquiring Bulgarian materials to indicate on copies of the list their holdings.

A long list of additional desiderata can be made up of studies of individual writers, periods, groupings and trends, translations of classics as well as current products, and so on. The list might include a bibliography of Bulgarian emigre literature since 1944 which has failed so far to receive recognition and attention as a phenomenon of twentieth century Bulgarian literature.